Rammohun Roy

Digitized by Google

THE

PRECEPTS OF JESUS,

THE

GUIDE TO PEACE AND HAPPINESS;

EXTRACTED FROM THE

BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

ASCRIBED TO THE FOUR EVANGELISTS.

TO WHICH ARE ADDED,

THE FIRST, SECOND, AND FINAL

APPEAL TO THE CHRISTIAN PUBLIC,

IN REPLY TO THE

OBSERVATIONS OF DR. MARSHMAN,

OF SERAMPORE.

BY RAMMOHUN ROY,

OF CALCUTTA.

FROM THE LONDON EDITION.

BOSTON:

CHRISTIAN REGISTER OFFICE.

1828.

Digitized by Google

BT
306
.R3
1828
cop. 2

Digitized by Google

PREFACE.

The works which are here presented to the public cannot fail to excite much interest, from the circumstances and character of the author. He has been for several years well known by name and reputation, both in India and England; but he has been known only as a learned and philanthropic Brahmin, the expounder of the religion, and the reformer of the institutions of his Hindoo countrymen. He now appears as a Christian professor, advocate, and controversialist.

Rammohun Roy was born about the year 1780, at Bordouan, in the province of Bengal. The first elements of his education he received under his paternal roof, where he also acquired a knowledge of the Persian language. He was afterwards sent to Patna to learn Arabic; and here, through the medium of Arabic translations of Aristotle and Euclid, he studied logic and the mathematics. When he had completed these studies, he went to Calcutta, to learn Sanscrit, the sacred language of the Hindoo Scriptures; the knowledge of which was indispensable to his caste and profession as a Brahmin. About the year 1804 or 1805, he became possessed, by the death of his father and of an elder and younger brother, of the whole of the family property, which is understood to have been very considerable. He now quitted

Digitized by Google

Bordouan, and fixed his residence at Moursheda-bad, where his ancestors had chiefly lived. Shortly after his settlement at this place, he commenced his literary career by the publication of a work in the Persian language, with a preface in Arabic, which he entitled, "Against the Idolatry of all Religions." The freedom with which he animadverted on their respective systems, gave great umbrage both to the Mahomedans and the Hindoos, and created him so many enemies, that he found it necessary to remove to Calcutta, where he again took up his residence in the year 1814.

Two years previously to this period, he had begun to study the English language, but he did not then apply to it with much ardour or success. Being some years subsequently appointed Dewan, or chief native officer in the collection of the revenues, and the duties of his office affording him frequent opportunities of mixing with English society, and of reading English documents, he applied to it with increased attention, and very soon qualified himself to speak and write it with considerable facility, correctness, and elegance. He afterwards studied the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages: of his proficiency in the two last of these he has given very decisive evidence in the tracts which are here published.

From his first work, "Against the Idolatry of all Religions," it is evident that he had been led at an early period of his life to regard with disapprobation the monstrous and debasing system of

Digitized by Google

Idolatry which was embraced by his countrymen. A careful study of the Sacred Writings of the Hindoos had also convinced him, that the prevailing notions respecting the multiplicity of Deities, and the superstitious devotion to the licentious and inhuman customs connected with them, were grounded upon an utter ignorance, or gross perversion of their religion. These original records appeared to him to inculcate a system of pure Theism, which maintained the existence of one sole God, infinite in his perfections, and eternal in his duration ; and that it required from its professors a mental rather than a corporeal worship, accompanied by strict and exemplary virtue. Having embraced these views of the Hindoo theology and morals, he became anxious to reform the creed and practice of his countrymen, and determined to devote his talents and his fortune to this important and honourable undertaking.

The body of Hindoo theology is comprised in the Veds, which are writings of very high antiquity. On account of their great bulk, and the obscurity of the style in which they are composed, Vyas, a person of great celebrity in Hindoo literature, was induced, about two thousand years ago, to draw up a compendious abstract of the whole, accompanied with explanations of the more difficult passages. This digest he entitled "The Vedent," or "The Resolution of the Veds," and it is generally esteemed as of equal authority with the original writings. This work

Digitized by Google

Rammohun Roy translated from the Sanscrit into the Bengalee and Hindoo languages, for the information of his countrymen. He also printed an abridgment of it in the same languages, which he distributed gratuitously as extensively as circumstances would admit. The abridgment he afterwards translated into English, in the expectation, as he states in the Preface, of proving to his European friends, "that the superstitious practices which deform the Hindoo religion, have nothing to do with the pure spirit of its dictates." Towards the conclusion of the same preface, he explains the reasons of his proceedings, and intimates the personal inconveniences to which he had exposed himself by his benevolent zeal.

"My constant reflections," he writes, "on the inconvenient, or rather injurious rites, introduced by the peculiar practice of Hindoo idolatry, which, more than any other Pagan worship, destroys the texture of society, together with compassion for my countrymen, have compelled me to use every possible effort to awaken them from their dream of error; and, by making them acquainted with the scriptures, enable them to contemplate, with true devotion, the unity and omnipresence of nature's God. By taking the path which conscience and sincerity direct, I, born a Brahmin, have exposed myself to the complainings and reproaches even of some of my relations, whose prejudices are strong, and whose temporal advantage depends upon the present system. But these, how-

Digitized by Google

ever accumulated, I can tranquilly bear; trusting that a day will arive when my humble endeavours will be viewed with justice—perhaps acknowledged with gratitude. At any rate, whatever men may say, I cannot be deprived of this consolation: my motives are acceptable to that Being, who beholds in secret, and compensates openly."*

After the publication of the Vedant, Rammohun Roy printed in Bengalee and in English some of the principal chapters of the Veds, "for the purpose of illustrating and confirming the view he had taken of them."†

In the preface to one of these tracts, the (Isho-

* See "Translation of an Abridgment of the Vedant, or Resolution of all the Veds; the most celebrated and revered Work of Brahminical Theology, establishing the Unity of the Supreme Being, and that he alone is the Object of Propitiation and Worship. By Rammohun Roy." Calcutta, 4to. 1816; 8vo. 1818; London, 4to. 1817.

† The titles of these pamphlets are as follows: 1. "Translation of the Cena Upanishad, one of the chapters of the Sama Veda, according to the Gloss of the celebrated Shancaracharya; establishing the Unity and Sole Omnipotence of the Supreme Being, and that he alone is the Object of Worship." Calcutta, 1816. 2. "Translation of the Ishopanishad, one of the Chapters of the Yajur Veda; according to the Commentary of the celebrated Shankar-Acharya; establishing the Unity and Incomprehensibility of the Supreme Being; and that his Worship alone can lead to eternal Beatitude." Calcutta, 1816. 3. "Translation of the Moonduk-Opunishud of the Uthurvu-Ved, according to the Gloss of the celebrated Shunkura-Charyu." Calcutta, 1819. 4. "Translation of the Kuth-Opunishud, of the Ujoor Ved, according to the Gloss of the celebrated Sunkuracharyu." 1819.

His other publications on the subject of Hindoo Reformation, consist of, 1. "A Defence of Hindoo Theism, in Reply to the attack of an Advocate for Idolatry at Madras." Calcutta, 1817. 2. A Second Defence of the Monotheistical System of the Veds, in Reply to

Digitized by Google

panishad,) after observing upon the superiority of the moral to the physical powers of man, and intimating that sorrow and remorse can scarcely fail, sooner or later, to be the portion of him who is conscious of having neglected opportunities of rendering benefit to his fellow creatures," he again adverts to his own case in the following terms: "From considerations like these it has been, that I, (although born a Brahmin, and instructed in my youth in all the principles of that sect,) being thoroughly convinced of the lamentable errors of my countrymen, have been stimulated to employ every means in my power to improve their minds, and lead them to the knowledge of a purer system of morality. Living constantly amongst Hindoos of different sects and professions, I have had ample opportunities of observing the superstitious puerilities into which they have been thrown by their self-interested guides; who, in defiance of the law as well as of common sense, have succeeded

an Apology for the present State of Hindoo Worship. Calcutta, 1817. 3. Translation of a Conference between an Advocate and an Opponent of the Practice of Burning Widows Alive, from the original Bungla." 1818. 4. "A Second Conference between an Advocate and an Opponent of the Practice of Burning Widows Alive, translated from the original Bengalee." Calcutta, 1820. Dedicated to the Marchioness of Hastings. 5. "An Apology for the Pursuit of Final Beatitude independently of Brahmunical Observances." Calcutta, 1820. 6. "Brief Remarks regarding Modern Encroachments on the Ancient Rites of Females, according to the Hindoo Law of Inheritance. Calcutta, printed at the Unitarian Press, 1822." The translation of the "Vedant," and of the "Cena Upanishad," were reprinted in London, in 1817. A review of some of these pamphlets is inserted in the Monthly Repository, Vol. XIV. pp. 561, &c.

Digitized by Google

but too well in conducting them to the temple of idolatry; and while they hide from their view the true substance of morality, have infused into their simple hearts a weak attachment for its mere shadow." After enumerating some of the evils arising from the existing theory and practice of Hindooism, and noticing the encouragement held out by it to every species of immorality and crime, he thus proceeds: "My reflections upon these solemn truths have been most painful for many years. I have never ceased to contemplate, with the strongest feelings of regret, the obstinate adherence of my countrymen to their fatal system of idolatry, enduring, for the sake of propitiating their supposed deities, the violation of every humane and social feeling; and this, in various instances, but more especially in the dreadful acts of self-destruction, and the immolation of the nearest relations, under the delusion of conforming to sacred religious rites. I have never ceased, I repeat, to contemplate these practices with the strongest feelings of regret, and to view in them the moral debasement of a race who, I cannot help thinking, are capable of better things; whose susceptibility, patience, and mildness of character, render them worthy of a better destiny. Under these impressions, therefore, I have been impelled to lay before them genuine translations of parts of their scripture, which inculcates not only the enlightened worship of one God, but the purest principles of morality, accompanied with such notices as I deemed requisite to oppose the argu-

Digitized by Google

ments of the Brahmins, in defence of their beloved system. Most earnestly do I pray, that the whole may, sooner or later, prove efficient in producing on the minds of Hindoos in general, a conviction of the rationality of believing in and adoring the Supreme Being only; together with a complete perception and practice of that grand and comprehensive moral principle—*Do unto others as you would be done by.*"

Although he experienced much opposition and discouragement in his work of reformation, he had the gratification of witnessing in many instances the beneficial effects of his labours. "It is with no ordinary feelings of satifaction," he states in the preface to the Cena Upanishad, "that I have already seen many respectable persons of my countrymen, to the great disappointment of their spiritual guides, rise superior to their original prejudices, and inquire into the truths of religion." And again, in his preface to the Kuth Opunishud, he writes, "The great body of my countrymen, possessed of good understandings, and not much fettered with prejudices, being perfectly satisfied of the truth of the doctrines contained in this, and in other works already laid by me before them, and of the gross errors of the puerile system of idol worship which they were led to follow, have altered their religious conduct in a manner becoming the dignity of human beings." "It seems to me," he remarks in conclusion, "that I cannot better employ my time, than in an endeavour to illustrate and maintain truth, and to render service

Digitized by Google

to my fellow-labourers, confiding in the mercy of that Being to whom the motives of our actions, and secrets of our hearts, are well known."

The liberal views, and the devout and amiable spirit, which are displayed in these extracts, and are, indeed, discernible in the whole of the author's writings, may be well thought to have disposed him to a candid examination of the Christian revelation. From the perusal of the New Testament, in his "long and uninterrupted researches into religious truth," he found, he asserts, "the doctrines of Christ more conducive to moral principles, and better adapted for the use of rational beings, than any other which had come to his knowledge."* The doctrine of the Trinity, however, which appeared to his mind quite as objectionable as the Polytheism of the Hindoos, presented an insuperable obstacle to his conversion to Christianity, as he found it professed by those with whom he conversed. But as the system so fully approved itself, in other respects, to his reason and his piety, his candour would not, on account of this single difficulty, allow him at once to reject it as false. As the most likely method of acquiring a correct knowledge of its doctrines, he determined upon a careful perusal of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures in their original languages. From this undertaking he arose with a firm persuasion, that the doctrine of the Trinity

* Preface to the London edition of the Translation of the Vedant. Monthly Repository, Vol. XIV. p. 562.

Digitized by Google

was not inculcated in them, and that the Christian religion was true and divine.

Having now become, upon deliberate and rational conviction, a Christian, he hastened to communicate to his countrymen such a view of the religion of the New Testament as he thought best adapted to impress them with a feeling of its excellence, and to imbue them with its pure and amiable spirit. For this purpose, he compiled the first pamphlet inserted in the present volume, which he intituled, "The Precepts of Jesus the Guide to Peace and Happiness," &c. To this work, which consists entirely of extracts from the moral discourses of our Lord, he prefixed an "Introduction," in which he stated his reasons for omitting the doctrines and the historical and miraculous relations which accompany them in the writings of the evangelists. Soon after the publication of this tract, there appeared in "The Friend of India,"* a periodical work under the direction of the Baptist missionaries, an article animadverting upon it, which was signed "A Christian Missionary," but written by the Rev. Mr. Schmidt. To this paper, Dr. Marshman, the editor of the magazine, appended some "Observations" of his own,† in which he styled the compiler of the "Precepts," "an intelligent HEATHEN, whose mind is as yet completely opposed to the *grand design* of the Saviour's becoming incarnate."

These "Observations" produced the second of

* No. XX. February, 1820.

† London edition of Dr. Marshman's Papers, p. 1.

Digitized by Google

the following pamphlets, intituled, "An Appeal to the Christian Public in Defence of the Precepts of Jesus, by a Friend to Truth." The writer is now known to have been Rammohun Roy himself. He complains, in strong terms, of the application to him of the term Heathen, as "a violation of truth, charity, and liberality;" and also controverts some of Dr. Marshman's objections to the compilation, and to his reasonings in the introduction. In a subsequent number of the "Friend of India,"* Dr. Marshman inserted a brief reply to this "Appeal," in which he still denied to the author the title of "Christian," because, he writes, "we belong to that class who think that no one can be a real Christian without believing the divinity and the atonement of Jesus Christ, and the divine authority of the whole of the Christian Scriptures," disclaiming, however, all intentions of using the term "Heathen" in an invidious sense.

Dr. Marshman, in his first "Observations," had promised to "take up the subject" of Rammohun Roy's work "more fully in the first number of the Quarterly Series" of The Friend of India, then in preparation. Accordingly, there appeared in that publication some "Observations on certain ideas contained in the Introduction to the Precepts of Jesus the Guide to Peace and Happiness."† In reply to this paper, Rammohun Roy published the last of the following pamphlets, in-

* No. XXIII. May, 1820. Dr. Marshman's Papers, London edition, p. 5.

† Idem, p. 17, Friend of India, September, 1820.

Digitized by Google

tituled, "A Second Appeal to the Christian Public in Defence of the Precepts of Jesus." To this tract Dr. Marshman printed an elaborate answer in the fourth number of the Quarterly Series of "The Friend of India."* Here the discussion rests, as far as we are at present informed.†

Dr. Marshman's friends having collected, and printed in England, his papers in this controversy,‡ it was thought by many to be demanded by truth and justice, that Rammohun Roy's pamphlets should also be given to the British public, to enable them to form an accurate judgment of the merits of both the parties in the support of their respective tenets. As there appeared no prospect of the work being undertaken by any bookseller, the Unitarian Society were induced to become the publishers. They are aware that, holding, as they do, the strict and proper humanity of Christ as one of their fundamental tenets, they may possibly be charged with a dereliction of principle in thus circulating, under their authority, a work which maintains his pre-existence, and super-angelic rank and dignity. But they rest their defence upon the peculiar nature of the case, and

* December, 1821. Dr. Marshman's Tracts, London edition, pp. 64, &c.

† The reader may be referred, for some further particulars relating to Rammohun Roy, to the Monthly Repository, vol. XIII. pp. 229, &c.; XIV. pp. 561, &c.; XV. pp. 1, &c.; XVI. pp. 477, &c.; XVII. pp. 682, &c.; and to Mr. Belsham's Introduction to William Roberts's (of Madras) First Letter to the Unitarian Society, 1818.

‡ The work is intituled, "A Defence of the Deity and Atonement of Jesus Christ, in Reply to Rammohun Roy, of Calcutta, by Dr. Marshman, of Serampore." London, 1822.

Digitized by Google

upon their anxiety to give every possible publicity to so learned and able a defence of the great doctrine of the proper unity of God, from the pen of a Hindoo convert to the Christian faith.

In reprinting the following pamphlets, the Calcutta editions have been strictly followed, except in a few instances, in which some obvious typographical errors have been corrected; and even the principal of these corrections have been inserted in brackets.

It is not intended in this preface to enter into a review of the controversy. Dr. Marshman has, however, made a remark, which, as it refers to the Unitarian Society, we may be permitted to notice. In raising an argument for the Deity of Christ, upon the supposed application to him of the term "fellow" in the English translation of Zechariah xiii. 7, he thus quotes Rammohun Roy's criticism upon that text: "Unable to deny this, our author merely hints in a note that עמיתי *Immithi*, fellow, signifies one that lives near another; 'therefore, the word fellow, in the English translation, is not altogether correct, as justly observed by Archbishop Newcome in his Improved Version,' lately published," adds Dr. Marshman, "by the SOCINIANS of England."* Dr. Marshman has here allowed his zeal to outrun his knowledge. The work quoted by Rammohun Roy is not Archbishop Newcome's translation of the New Testament, which formed the basis of the "Improved

* "Dr. Marshman's Defence," &c. p. 133

Digitized by Google

Version," published by the Unitarian Society; but that learned prelate's "Attempt towards an Improved Version, &c. of the Twelve Minor Prophets;" a production well worthy of the perusal of every Biblical student.

It is with regret we observe, that Dr. Marshman, who, in general, writes like a scholar and a gentleman, has, in the passage above cited, condescended to imitate the conduct of some low bigots on this side of the water, in designating the Unitarians by the term "Socinians," which, he must know, is not correctly descriptive of their opinions, and is generally employed as an epithet of reproach.

With almost the solitary exception of this deviation from liberality, it affords us great pleasure to be able to remark, that the controversy on both sides has throughout been conducted with a spirit of Christian candour and fairness, which is highly honourable to the able and learned disputants.

THOMAS REES,

Secretary to the Unitarian Society.

Kennington, March 14, 1823.

Digitized by Google

THE

PRECEPTS OF JESUS,

THE

GUIDE TO PEACE AND HAPPINESS;

EXTRACTED FROM THE

BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT,

ASCRIBED TO THE FOUR EVANGELISTS.

WITH

Translations into Sunscrit and Bengalee.

FROM THE LONDON EDITION.

NEW-YORK:
PUBLISHED BY B. BATES, 380 BROADWAY.

1825.

Digitized by Google

Clayton & Van Norden, Printers, 64 Pine-street.

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS.

Page

The Precepts of Jesus the Guide to Peace and Happiness; extracted from the Books of the New Testament, ascribed to the Four Evangelists 1

An Appeal to the Christian Public, in Defence of the "Precepts of Jesus" 99

A Second Appeal to the Christian Public, in Defence of the "Precepts of Jesus" 131

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

INTRODUCTION.

A conviction in the mind of its total ignorance of the nature and of the specific attributes of the Godhead, and a sense of doubt respecting the real essence of the soul, give rise to feelings of great dissatisfaction with our limited powers, as well as with all human acquirements which fail to inform us on these interesting points. On the other hand, a notion of the existence of a supreme superintending power, the author and preserver of this harmonious system, who has organized, and who regulates such an infinity of celestial and terrestrial objects; and a due estimation of that law which teaches that man should do unto others as he would wish to be done by, reconcile us to human nature, and tend to render our existence agreeable to ourselves, and profitable to the rest of mankind. The former of these sources of satisfaction, viz. a belief in God, prevails generally; being derived either from tradition and instruction, or from an attentive survey of the wonderful skill and contrivance displayed in the works of nature. The latter, although it is partially taught also in every system of religion with which I am acquainted, is principally inculcated by Christianity. This essential characteristic of the Chris-

Digitized by Google

tian religion I was for a long time unable to distinguish as such, amidst the various doctrines I found insisted upon in the writings of Christian authors, and in the conversation of those teachers of Christianity with whom I have had the honour of holding communication. Amongst those opinions, the most prevalent seems to be, that no one is justly entitled to the appellation of Christian who does not believe in the divinity of Christ, and of the Holy Ghost, as well as in the divine nature of God, the Father of all created beings. Many allow a much greater latitude to the term Christian, and consider it as comprehending all who acknowledge the Bible to contain the revealed will of God, however they may differ from others in their interpretations of particular passages of scripture; whilst some require from him who claims the title of Christian, only an adherence to the doctrines of Christ, as taught by himself, without insisting on implicit confidence in those of the Apostles, as being, except when speaking from inspiration, like other men, liable to mistake and error. That they were so is obvious from the several instances of differences of opinion amongst the Apostles recorded in the Acts and Epistles.*

Voluminous works, written by learned men of particular sects for the purpose of establishing the truth, consistency, rationality, and priority of

* Vide Acts, ch. xi. vers. 2, 3. ch. xv. vers. 2, 7.; 1 Corinthians, ch. i. ver. 12.; Galatians, ch. ii. vers, 11—13.

Digitized by Google

their own peculiar doctrines, contain such a variety of arguments, that I cannot hope to be able to adduce here any new reasonings of sufficient novelty and force to attract the notice of my readers. Besides, in matters of religion particularly, men in general, through prejudice and partiality to the opinions which they once form, pay little or no attention to opposite sentiments, (however reasonable they may be,) and often turn a deaf ear to what is most consistent with the laws of nature, and conformable to the dictates of human reason and divine revelation. At the same time, to those who are not biassed by prejudice, and who are, by the grace of God, open to conviction, a simple enumeration and statement of the respective tenets of different sects may be a sufficient guide to direct their inquiries in ascertaining which of them is the most consistent with the sacred traditions, and most acceptable to common sense. For these reasons, I decline entering into any discussion on those points, and confine my attention at present to the task of laying before my fellow-creatures the words of Christ, with a translation from the English into Sungskrit, and the language of Bengal. I feel persuaded that by separating from the other matters contained in the New Testament, the moral precepts found in that book, these will be more likely to produce the desirable effect of improving the hearts and minds of men of different persuasions and degrees of understanding. For, historical, and

Digitized by Google

some other passages, are liable to the doubts and disputes of free-thinkers and anti-christians, especially miraculous relations, which are much less wonderful than the fabricated tales handed down to the natives of Asia,* and consequently would be apt at best to carry little weight with them. On the contrary, moral doctrines, tending evidently to the maintenance of the peace and harmony of mankind at large, are beyond the reach of metaphysical perversion, and intelligible alike to the learned and to the unlearned. This simple code of religion and morality is so admirably calculated to elevate men's ideas to high and liberal notions of one God, who has equally subjected all living creatures, without distinction of cast, rank, or wealth, to change, disappointment, pain, and death, and has equally admitted all to be partakers of the bountiful mercies which he has lavished over nature, and is also so well fitted to regulate the conduct of the human race in the discharge of their various duties to God, to themselves, and to society, that I cannot but hope the best effects from its promulgation in the present form.

* Ugisti is famed for having swallowed the ocean, when it had given him offence, and having restored it by urinary evacuation: at his command, also, the Vindhyu range of mountains prostrated itself, and so remains. (*Wilson's Dictionary.*)

Digitized by Google

THE

PRECEPTS OF JESUS,

THE

Guide to Peace and Happiness.

---

* And seeing the multitudes, he went up into a mountain; and when he was set, his disciples came unto him; and he opened his mouth, and taught them, saying, Blessed *are* the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed *are* they that mourn: for they shall be comforted. Blessed *are* the meek: for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed *are* they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled. Blessed *are* the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy. Blessed *are* the pure in heart: for they shall see God. Blessed *are* the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God. Blessed *are* they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are ye, when *men* shall revile you, and persecute *you*, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice, and

* Matthew, chap. v.

Digitized by Google

be exceeding glad: for great *is* your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you.

Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost his savour, wherewith shall it be salted? It is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men. Ye are the light of the whole world. A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid. Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick; and it giveth light unto all that are in the house. Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.

Think not that I am come to destroy the Law, or the Prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach *them*, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed *the righteousness* of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.

Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment: but I say

Digitized by Google

unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire. Therefore, if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee; leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift. Agree with thine adversary quickly, whilst thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Verily I say unto thee, Thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing.

Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery: but I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart. And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast *it* from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not *that* thy whole body should be cast into hell. And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off, and cast *it* from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not *that* thy whole body should be cast into hell. It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of di-

Digitized by Google

vorcement: but I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.

Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the Publicans the same? And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more *than others*? do not even the Publicans so? Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.

* Take heed that ye do not your alms before men, to be seen of them: otherwise ye have no reward of your Father which is in heaven. Therefore, when thou doest *thine* alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets, that they may have glory of men. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward. But when thou doest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth:

* Matthew, chap. vi.

Digitized by Google

that thine alms may be in secret: and thy Father which seeth in secret, himself shall reward thee openly.

And when thou prayest, thou shalt not be as the hypocrites *are*: for they love to pray standing in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward. But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly. But when ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen *do*: for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking. Be not ye, therefore, like unto them: for your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask him. After this manner, therefore, pray ye; Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as *it is* in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: for thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen. For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you: but if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses.

Moreover when ye fast, be not, as the hypocrites, of a sad countenance: for they disfigure

Digitized by Google

their faces, that they may appear unto men to fast. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward. But thou, when thou fastest, anoint thine head, and wash thy face; that thou appear not unto men to fast, but unto thy Father who is in secret: and thy Father, who seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly.

Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal: but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal: for where your treasure is, there will your heart be also. The light of the body is the eye: if therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light. But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness. If, therefore, the light that is in thee be darkness, how great *is* that darkness!

No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon. Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment? Behold the fowls of the air; for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they? Which of you by taking thought

Digitized by Google

can add one cubit unto his stature? And why take ye thought for raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin: and yet I say unto you, that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, *shall he* not much more *clothe* you, O ye of little faith? Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? (for after all these things do the Gentiles seek:) for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things. But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you. Take, therefore, no thought for the morrow: for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day *is* the evil thereof.

* Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again. And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye? Or how wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye; and, behold, a beam *is* in thine own eye? Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly

* Matthew, chap. vii.

Digitized by Google

to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye. Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you. Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you: for every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened. Or what man is there of you, whom if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone? Or if he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent? If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him? Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the Law and the Prophets.

Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide *is* the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat: because strait *is* the gate, and narrow *is* the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it. Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither *can* a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit, is hewn down,

Digitized by Google

and cast into the fire. Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them. Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord. shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity.

Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock: and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock. And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand: and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell: and great was the fall of it. And it came to pass, when Jesus had ended these sayings, the people were astonished at his doctrine: for he taught them as *one* having authority, and not as the Scribes.

* And it came to pass, as Jesus sat at meat in the house, behold, many Publicans and sinners came and sat down with him and his disciples.

* Matthew, chap. ix. 10.

Digitized by Google

And when the Pharisees saw it, they said unto his disciples, Why eateth your Master with Publicans and sinners? But when Jesus heard that, he said unto them, They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick. But go ye and learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice: I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance. Then came to him the disciples of John, saying, Why do we and the Pharisees fast oft, but thy disciples fast not? And Jesus said unto them, Can the children of the bride-chamber mourn, as long as the bridegroom is with them? But the days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken from them, and then shall they fast. No man putteth a piece of new cloth unto an old garment, for that which is put in to fill it up taketh from the garment, and the rent is made worse. Neither do men put new wine into old bottles; else the bottles break, and the wine runneth out, and the bottles perish; but they put new wine into new bottles, and both are preserved

* Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves: be ye, therefore, wise as serpents, and harmless as doves. But beware of men: for they will deliver you up to the councils, and they will scourge you in their synagogues: and ye shall be brought before governors and kings for my sake, for a testimony against them and the Gentiles. But when they deliver you up,

* Matthew, chap. x. 16.

Digitized by Google

take no thought how or what ye shall speak: for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you. And the brother shall deliver up the brother to death, and the father the child: and the children shall rise up against *their* parents, and cause them to be put to death. And ye shall be hated of all *men* for my name's sake: but he that endureth to the end shall be saved. But when they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another: for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come. The disciple is not above *his* master, nor the servant above his lord. It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord. If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more *shall they call* them of his household? Fear them not therefore; for there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; and hid, that shall not be known. What I tell you in darkness, *that* speak ye in light: and what ye hear in the ear, *that* preach ye upon the housetops. And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell. Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father. But the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear ye not, therefore, ye are of more value than many sparrows. Whosoever, there-

Digitized by Google

fore, shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven. Think not that I come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. And a man's foes *shall be* they of his own household. He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me, is not worthy of me. And he that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me. He that findeth his life shall lose it: and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it. He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me. He that receiveth a prophet in the name of a prophet, shall receive a prophet's reward; and he that receiveth a righteous man in the name of a righteous man, shall receive a righteous man's reward. And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold *water* only in the name of a disciple, verily I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward.

* At that time Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and pru-

* Matthew, chap. xi. 25.

Digitized by Google

dent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father: for so it seemed good in thy sight. All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and *he* to whomsoever the Son will reveal *him*. Come unto me, all *ye* that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke *is* easy, and my burden is light.

* At that time Jesus went on the Sabbath-day through the corn; and his disciples were an hungered, and began to pluck the ears of corn, and to eat. But when the Pharisees saw *it*, they said unto him, Behold, thy disciples do that which is not lawful to do upon the Sabbath-day. But he said unto them, Have ye not read what David did, when he was an hungered, and they that were with him; how he entered into the house of God, and did eat the shewbread, which was not lawful for him to eat, neither for them which were with him, but only for the priests? Or have ye not read in the law, how that on the Sabbath-days the priests in the temple profane the Sabbath, and are blameless? But I say unto you, That in this place is *one* greater than the temple. But if ye had known what *this* meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned

* Matthew, chap. xii.

Digitized by Google

the guiltless. For the Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath-day.

And when he was departed thence, he went into their synagogue: And, behold, there was a man which had *his* hand withered. And they asked him, saying, Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath-days? that they might accuse him. And he said unto them, What man shall there be among you, that shall have one sheep, and if it fall into a pit on the Sabbath-day, will he not lay hold on it, and lift *it* out? How much then is a man better than a sheep! Wherefore it is lawful to do well on the Sabbath-days. Then saith he to the man, Stretch forth thine hand. And he stretched *it* forth; and it was restored whole, like as the other.

* He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad. Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy *against* the *Holy* Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the *world* to come. Either make the tree good, and his fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt, and his fruit corrupt: for the tree is known by *his* fruit. O generation of vipers,

* Matthew, chap. xii. 30.

Digitized by Google

how can ye, being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. A good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things: and an evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth evil things. But I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment. For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned.

While he yet talked to the people, behold, *his* mother and his brethren stood without, desiring to speak with him. Then one said unto him, Behold, thy mother and brethren stand without, desiring to speak with thee. But he answered and said unto him that told him, Who is my mother? and who are my brethren? And he stretched forth his hand toward his disciples, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother.

* The same day went Jesus out of the house, and sat by the sea-side. And great multitudes were gathered together unto him, so that he went into a ship, and sat; and the whole multitude stood on the shore. And he spake many things unto them in parables, saying, Behold, a sower went forth to sow; and when he sowed, some

* Matthew, chap. xiii.

Digitized by Google

seeds fell by the way side, and the fowls came and devoured them up: some fell upon stony places, where they had not much earth: and forthwith they sprung up, because they had no deepness of earth: and when the sun was up, they were scorched; and because they had no root, they withered away. And some fell among thorns; and the thorns sprung up, and choked them: but other fell into good ground, and brought forth fruit, some an hundredfold, some sixtyfold, some thirtyfold. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear. And the disciples came, and said unto him, Why speakest thou unto them in parables? He answered and said unto them, Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given. For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance: but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath. Therefore speak I to them in parables: because they seeing, see not; and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand. And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive: for this people's heart is waxed gross, and *their* ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with *their* eyes, and hear with *their* ears, and should understand with *their* heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them. But blessed *are* your

Digitized by Google

eyes, [for they see: and your ears,] for they hear. For verily I say unto you, That many prophets and righteous *men* have desired to see *those things* which ye see, and have not seen *them*; and to hear *those things* which ye hear, and have not heard *them*. Hear ye, therefore, the parable of the sower. When any one heareth the word of the kingdom, and understandeth *it* not, then cometh the wicked *one*, and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart. This is he which received seed by the way side. But he that received the seed into stony places, the same is he that heareth the word, and anon with joy receiveth it: yet hath he not root in himself, but dureth for a while: for when tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word, by and by he is offended. He also that received seed among the thorns is he that heareth the word; and the care of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches, choke the word, and he becometh unfruitful. But he that received seed into the good ground, is he that heareth the word, and understandeth *it*; which also beareth fruit, and bringeth forth, some an hundredfold, some sixty, some thirty. Another parable put he forth unto them, saying, The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man who sowed good seed in his field: but while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way. But when the blade was sprung up, and brought forth fruit, then appeared the tares also. So the servants of the householder came and said unto him, Sir, didst

Digitized by Google

not thou sow good seed in thy field? From whence then hath it tares? He said unto them, An enemy hath done this. The servants said unto him, Wilt thou then that we go and gather them up? But he said, Nay; lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them. Let both grow together until the harvest: and in the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them: but gather the wheat into my barn. Another parable put he forth unto them, saying, The kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and sowed in his field: which indeed is the least of all seeds; but when it is grown, it is the greatest among herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof. Another parable spake he unto them; The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven, which a woman took, and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened. All these things spake Jesus unto the multitude in parables; and without a parable spake he not unto them: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, I will open my mouth in parables; I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world. Then Jesus sent the multitude away, and went into the house: and his disciples came unto him, saying, Declare unto us the parable of the tares of the field. He answered and said unto them, He that soweth the good seed

Digitized by Google

is the Son of man; the field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked *one:* the enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels. As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this world. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear.

* Then came to Jesus Scribes and Pharisees, which were of Jerusalem, saying, Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? for they wash not their hands when they eat bread. But he answered and said unto them, Why do you also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition? For God commanded, saying, Honour thy father and mother: and, He that curseth father or mother, let him die the death. But ye say, Whosoever shall say to *his* father or *his* mother, *It is* a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; and honour not his father or his mother, *he shall be free.* Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect

* Matthew, chap. xv.

Digitized by Google

by your tradition. *Ye* hypocrites, well did Esaias prophesy of you, saying, This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoureth me with *their* lips; but their heart is far from me. But in vain they do worship me, teaching *for* doctrines the commandments of men. And he called the multitude, and said unto them, Hear and understand: Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man; but that which cometh out of the mouth, this defileth a man. Then came his disciples, and said unto him, Knowest thou that the Pharisees were offended, after they heard this saying? But he answered and said, Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up. Let them alone: they be blind leaders of the blind. And if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch. Then answered Peter and said unto him, Declare unto us this parable. And Jesus said, Are ye also yet without understanding? Do not ye yet understand, that whatsoever entereth in at the mouth goeth into the belly, and is cast out into the draught? But those things which proceed out of the mouth come forth from the heart; and they defile the man. For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witnesses, blasphemies: these are *the things* which defile a man: but to eat with unwashen hands defileth not a man.

* And when his disciples were come to the

* Matthew, chap. xvi. 5.

Digitized by Google

other side, they had forgotten to take bread. Then Jesus said unto them, Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees. And they reasoned among themselves, saying, *It is* because we have taken no bread. *Which* when Jesus perceived, he said unto them, O ye of little faith, why reason ye among yourselves, because ye have brought no bread? How is it that ye do not understand that I spake *it* not to you concerning bread, that ye should beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees? Then understood they how that he bade *them* not beware of the leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.

When Jesus came into the coasts of Cæsarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying, Whom do men say that I the Son of man am? And they said, Some *say that thou art* John the Baptist: some, Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets. He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed *it* unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever

Digitized by Google

thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. Then charged he his disciples that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ. From that time forth began Jesus to show unto his disciples, how that he must go into Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and Scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day. Then Peter took him, and began to rebuke him, saying, Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall not be unto thee. But he turned, and said unto Peter, Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art an offence unto me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men. Then said Jesus unto his disciples, If any *man* will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. For whosoever will save his life shall lose it: and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it. For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul? For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.

* At the same time came the disciples unto Je-

* Matthew, chap. xviii.

Digitized by Google

sus, saying, Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven? And Jesus called a little child unto him, and set him in the midst of them, and said, Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever, therefore, shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven. And whoso shall receive one such little child in my name, receiveth me. But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and *that* he were drowned in the depth of the sea.

Wo unto the world because of offences! For it must needs be that offences come; but wo to that man by whom the offence cometh! Wherefore if thy hand or thy foot offend thee, cut them off, and cast *them* from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire. And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast *it* from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell-fire. Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, That in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father, which is in heaven. For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost. How think ye? If a man have an hundred sheep, and one of them be gone

Digitized by Google

astray, doth he not leave the ninety and nine, and goeth into the mountains, and seeketh that which is gone astray? And if so be that he find it, verily I say unto you, he rejoiceth more of that *sheep*, than of the ninety and nine which went not astray. Even so it is not the will of your Father which is in heaven, that one of these little ones should perish. Moreover, if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear *thee, then* take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell *it* unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican. Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. Again I say unto you, That if two of you shall agree on earth as touching any thing that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven. For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.

Then came Peter to him, and said, Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? Till seven times? Jesus saith unto him, I say not unto thee, Until seven times: but, Until seventy times seven. Therefore is the kingdom of heaven likened unto a certain king, which

Digitized by Google

would take account of his servants. And when he had begun to reckon, one was brought unto him, which owed him ten thousand talents. But forasmuch as he had not to pay, his lord commanded him to be sold, and his wife, and children, and all that he had, and payment to be made. The servant therefore fell down, and worshipped him, saying, Lord, have patience with me, and I will pay thee all. Then the lord of that servant was moved with compassion, and loosed him, and forgave him the debt. But the same servant went out, and found one of his fellow-servants, which owed him an hundred pence: and he laid hands on him, and took *him* by the throat, saying, Pay me that thou owest. And his fellow-servant fell down at his feet, and besought him, saying, Have patience with me, and I will pay thee all. And he would not: but went and cast him into prison, till he should pay the debt. So when his fellow-servants saw what was done, they were very sorry, and came and told unto their lord all that was done. Then his lord, after that he had called him, said unto him, O thou wicked servant, I forgave thee all that debt, because thou desiredst me: shouldest not thou also have had compassion on thy fellow-servant, even as I had pity on thee? And his lord was wroth, and delivered him to the tormentors, till he should pay all that was due unto him. So likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses.

Digitized by Google

* The Pharisees also came unto him, tempting him, and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made *them* at the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away? He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so. And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except *it be* for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery. His disciples say unto him, If the case of the man be so with *his* wife, it is not good to marry. But he said unto them, All *men* cannot receive this saying, save *they* to whom it is given. For there are some eunuchs, which were so born from *their* mother's womb: and there are some eunuchs, which were made eunuchs of men: and there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive *it*, let him receive *it*.

* Matthew, chap. xix. 3.

Digitized by Google

Then were there brought unto him little children, that he should put *his* hands on them, and pray: and the disciples rebuked them. But Jesus said, Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me: for of such is the kingdom of heaven. And he laid *his* hands on them, and departed thence. And, behold, one came and said unto him, Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life? And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? *there is* none good but one, *that is*, God: but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. He saith unto him, Which? Jesus said, Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Honour thy father and *thy* mother: and, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. The young man saith unto him, All these things have I kept from my youth up: what lack I yet? Jesus said unto him, If thou wilt be perfect, go *and* sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come *and* follow me. But when the young man heard that saying, he went away sorrowful: for he had great possessions. Then said Jesus unto his disciples, Verily I say unto you, That a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven. And again I say unto you, It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God. When his disciples heard *it*, they were exceedingly amazed, saying,

Digitized by Google

Who then can be saved? But Jesus beheld *them*, and said unto them, With men this is impossible; but with God all things are possible. Then answered Peter and said unto him, Behold, we have forsaken all, and followed thee; what shall we have therefore? And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. And every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my name's sake, shall receive an hundredfold, and shall inherit everlasting life. But many *that are* first shall be last; and the last *shall be* first.

* For the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man *that is* an householder, which went out early in the morning to hire labourers into his vineyard. And when he had agreed with the labourers for a penny a-day, he sent them into his vineyard. And he went out about the third hour, and saw others standing idle in the market-place, and said unto them; Go ye also into the vineyard, and whatsoever is right I will give you. And they went their way. Again he went out about the sixth and ninth hour, and did likewise. And about the eleventh hour he went out, and found others standing idle, and saith unto them, Why stand ye here all the day idle? They say unto him, Because

* Matthew, chap. xx.

Digitized by Google

no man hath hired us. He saith unto them, Go ye also into the vineyard; and whatsoever is right, *that* shall ye receive. So when even was come, the lord of the vineyard saith unto his steward, Call the labourers, and give them *their* hire, beginning from the last unto the first. And when they came that *were hired* about the eleventh hour, they received every man a penny. But when the first came, they supposed that they should have received more; and they likewise received every man a penny. And when they had received *it*, they murmured against the goodman of the house, saying, These last have wrought *but* one hour, and thou hast made them equal unto us, which have borne the burden and heat of the day. But he answered one of them, and said, Friend, I do thee no wrong: didst not thou agree with me for a penny? Take *that* thine *is*, and go thy way: I will give unto this last, even as unto thee. Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own? Is thine eye evil, because I am good? So the last shall be first, and the first last: for many be called, but few chosen.

Then came to him the mother of Zebedee's children with her sons, worshipping *him*, and desiring a certain thing of him. And he said unto her, What wilt thou? She saith unto him, Grant that these my two sons may sit, the one on thy right hand, and the other on the left, in thy kingdom. But Jesus answered and said, Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink of the cup

Digitized by Google

that I shall drink of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? They say unto him, We are able. And he saith unto them, Ye shall drink indeed of my cup, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with: but to sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give, but *it shall be given to them* for whom it is prepared of my Father. And when the ten heard *it*, they were moved with indignation against the two brethren. But Jesus called them *unto him*, and said, Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant: even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.

* And when he was come into the temple, the chief priests and the elders of the people came unto him as he was teaching, and said, By what authority doest thou these things? and who gave thee this authority? And Jesus answered and said unto them, I also will ask you one thing, which if ye tell me, I in like wise will tell you by what authority I do these things. The baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven, or of men? And they reasoned with themselves, saying, If we

* Matthew, chap. xxi. 23.

Digitized by Google

shall say, From heaven; he will say unto us, Why did ye not then believe him? But if we shall say Of men; we fear the people; for all hold John as a prophet. And they answered Jesus, and said, We cannot tell. And he said unto them, Neither *tell* I you by what authority I do these things. But what think ye? A *certain* man had two sons; and he came to the first, and said, Son, go work to-day in my vineyard. He answered and said, I will not: but afterward he repented, and went. And he came to the second, and said likewise. And he answered and said, I go, sir; and went not. Whether of them twain did the will of *his* father? They say unto him, The first. Jesus saith unto them, Verily I say unto you, That the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you. For John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and ye believed him not: but the publicans and the harlots believed him: and ye, when ye had seen *it*, repented not afterward, that ye might believe him. Hear another parable: There was a certain householder, which planted a vineyard, and hedged it round about, and digged a wine-press in it, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country: and when the time of the fruit drew near, he sent his servants to the husbandmen, that they might receive the fruits of it. And the husbandmen took his servants, and beat one, and killed another, and stoned another. Again, he sent other servants more than the first: and

Digitized by Google

they did unto them likewise. But last of all he sent unto them his son, saying, They will reverence my son. But when the husbandmen saw the son, they said among themselves, This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and let us seize on his inheritance. And they caught him, and cast *him* out of the vineyard, and slew *him*. When the lord therefore of the vineyard cometh, what will he do unto those husbandmen? They say unto him, He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out *his* vineyard unto other husbandmen, which shall render him the fruits in their seasons. Jesus saith unto them, Did ye never read in the Scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes? Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder.

* The kingdom of heaven is like unto a certain king, which made a marriage for his son, and sent forth his servants to cal them that were bidden to the wedding: and they would not come. Again, he sent forth other servants, saying, Tell them which are bidden, Behold, I have prepared my dinner: my oxen and *my* fatlings *are* killed, and

* Matthew, chap. xxii 2.

Digitized by Google

all things *are* ready: come unto the marriage. But they made light of *it*, and went their ways, one to his farm, and another to his merchandise: and the remnant took his servants, and entreated *them* spitefully, and slew *them*. But when the king heard *thereof*, he was wroth: and he sent forth his armies, and destroyed those murderers, and burned up their city. Then saith he to his servants, The wedding is ready, but they which were bidden were not worthy. Go ye therefore into the highways, and as many as ye shall find, bid to the marriage. So those servants went out into the highways, and gathered together all as many as they found, both bad and good: and the wedding was furnished with guests. And when the king came in to see the guests, he saw there a man which had not on a wedding garment: and he saith unto him, Friend, how camest thou in hither, not having a wedding garment? And he was speechless. Then said the king to the servants, Bind him hand and foot, and take him away, and cast *him* into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. For many are called, but few *are* chosen.

Then went the Pharisees, and took counsel how they might entangle him in *his* talk. And they sent out unto him their disciples with the Herodians, saying, Master, we know that thou art true, and teachest the way of God in truth, neither carest thou for any *man:* for thou regardest not the person of men. Tell us, therefore, what

Digitized by Google

thinkest thou; Is it lawful to give tribute unto Cæsar, or not? But Jesus perceived their wickedness, and said, Why tempt ye me, *ye* hypocrites? Show me the tribute money. And they brought unto him a penny. And he saith unto them, Whose *is* this image and superscription? They say unto him, Cæsar's. Then saith he unto them, Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's. When they had heard *these words*, they marvelled, and left him, and went their way.

The same day came to him the Sadducees, which say that there is no resurrection, and asked him, saying, Master, Moses said, If a man die, having no children, his brother shall marry his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. Now there were with us seven brethren: and the first, when he had married a wife, deceased, and, having no issue, left his wife unto his brother: likewise the second also, and the third, unto the seventh. And last of all the woman died also. Therefore, in the resurrection, whose wife shall she be of the seven? for they all had her. Jesus answered and said unto them, Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven. But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not

Digitized by Google

the God of the dead, but of the living. And when the multitude heard *this*, they were astonished at his doctrine.

But when the Pharisees had heard that he had put the Sadducees to silence, they were gathered together. Then one of them, *who was* a Lawyer, asked *him a question*, tempting him, and saying, Master, which *is* the great commandment in the law? Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the Law and the Prophets.

While the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them, saying, What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? They say unto him, *The Son* of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord? saying, The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool. If David then call him Lord, how is he his son? And no man was able to answer him a word, neither durst any *man* from that day forth ask him any more *questions*.

* Then spake Jesus to the multitude, and to his disciples, saying, The Scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, *that* observe and do; but do not

* Matthew, chap. xxiii.

Digitized by Google

ye after their works: for they say, and do not. For they bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay *them* on men's shoulders, but they *themselves* will not move them with one of their fingers. But all their works they do for to be seen of men: they make broad their phylacteries, and enlarge the borders of their garments, and love the uppermost rooms at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues, and greetings in the markets, and to be called of men, Rabbi, Rabbi. But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master, *even* Christ; and all ye are brethren. And call no *man* your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, who is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, *even* Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant. And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted. But wo unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in *yourselves*, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in. Wo unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation. Wo unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves. Wo unto you, *ye* blind guides, which say, Whosoever shall swear by the

Digitized by Google

temple, it is nothing; but whosoever shall swear by the gold of the temple, he is a debtor. *Ye* fools and blind: for whether is greater, the gold, or the temple that sanctifieth the gold? And, whosoever shall swear by the altar, it is nothing; but whosoever sweareth by the gift that is upon it, he is guilty. *Ye* fools and blind: for whether *is* greater, the gift, or the altar that sanctifieth the gift? Whoso therefore shall swear by the altar, sweareth by it, and by all things thereon. And whoso shall swear by the temple, sweareth by it, and by him that dwelleth therein. And he that shall swear by heaven, sweareth by the throne of God, and by him that sitteth thereon. Wo unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier *matters* of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone. *Ye* blind guides, which strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel. Wo unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess. *Thou* blind Pharisee, cleanse first that *which is* within the cup and platter, that the outside of them may be clean also. Wo unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead *men's* bones, and of all uncleanness. Even so ye outwardly appear righteous unto men,

Digitized by Google

but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity. Wo unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous, and say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets. Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers. *Ye* serpents, *ye* generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell? Wherefore, behold, I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes: and *some* of them ye shall kill and crucify; and *some* of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute *them* from city to city: that upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. Verily I say unto you, All these things shall come upon this generation. O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, *thou* that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under *her* wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed *is* he that cometh in the name of the Lord.

* Watch therefore; for ye know not what hour

* Matthew, chap. xxii. 42.

Digitized by Google

your Lord doth come. But know this, that if the good man of the house had known in what watch the thief would come, he would have watched, and would not have suffered his house to be broken up. Therefore be ye also ready: for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh. Who then is a faithful and wise servant, whom his lord hath made ruler over his household, to give them meat in due season? Blessed *is* that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing. Verily I say unto you, That he shall make him ruler over all his goods. But and if that evil servant shall say in his heart, My lord delayeth his coming; and shall begin to smite *his* fellow-servants, and to eat and drink with the drunken; the lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for *him*, and in an hour that he is not aware of, and shall cut him asunder, and appoint *him* his portion with the hypocrites; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

* Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins, which took their lamps, and went forth to meet the bridegroom. And five of them were wise, and five *were* foolish. They that *were* foolish took their lamps, and took no oil with them; but the wise took oil in their vessels with their lamps. While the bridegroom tarried, they all slumbered and slept. And at midnight there was a cry made, Behold the bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet him. Then all those virgins

* Matthew, chap. xxv.

Digitized by Google

arose, and trimmed their lamps. And the foolish said unto the wise, Give us of your oil; for our lamps are gone out. But the wise answered, saying, *Not so;* lest there be not enough for us and you: but go ye rather to them that sell, and buy for yourselves. And while they went to buy, the bridegroom came; and they that were ready went in with him to the marriage: and the door was shut. Afterward came also the other virgins, saying, Lord, Lord, open to us. But he answered and said, Verily I say unto you, I know you not. Watch therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh. For *the kingdom of heaven* is as a man travelling into a far country, *who* called his own servants, and delivered unto them his goods. And unto one he gave five talents, to another two, and to another one; to every man according to his several ability; and straightway took his journey. Then he that had received the five talents went and traded with the same, and made *them* other five talents. And likewise he that *had received* two, he also gained other two. But he that received one went and digged in the earth, and hid his lord's money. After a long time the lord of those servants cometh, and reckoneth with them. And so he that had received five talents came and brought other five talents, saying, Lord, thou deliveredst unto me five talents: behold, I have gained besides them five talents more. His lord said unto him, Well done, *thou* good and faithful servant: thou

Digitized by Google

hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy lord. He also that had received two talents came and said, Lord, thou deliveredst unto me two talents: behold, I have gained two other talents besides them. His lord said unto him, Well done, good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy lord. Then he which had received the one talent came and said, Lord, I knew thee that thou art a hard man, reaping where thou hast not sown, and gathering where thou hast not strawed: and I was afraid, and went and hid thy talent in the earth: lo, *there* thou hast *that is* thine. His lord answered and said unto him, *Thou* wicked and slothful servant, thou knewest that I reap where I sowed not, and gather where I have not strawed: thou oughtest therefore to have put my money to the exchangers, and *then* at my coming I should have received mine own with usury. Take therefore the talent from him, and give *it* unto him which hath ten talents. For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but from him that hath not, shall be taken away even that which he hath. And cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him

Digitized by Google

shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth *his* sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: for I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me. Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, and fed *thee?* or thirsty, and gave *thee* drink? When saw we thee a stranger, and took *thee* in? or naked, and clothed *thee?* Or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee? And the king shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done *it* unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done *it* unto me. Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels: for I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not: sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not. Then shall they also answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister

Digitized by Google

unto thee? Then shall he answer them, saying, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did *it* not to one of the least of these, ye did *it* not to me. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal.

* And it came to pass, that, as Jesus sat at meat in his house, many publicans and sinners sat also together with Jesus and his disciples: for there were many, and they followed him. And when the Scribes and Pharisees saw him eat with publicans and sinners, they said unto his disciples, How is it that he eateth and drinketh with publicans and sinners? When Jesus heard *it*, he saith unto them, They that are whole have no need of the physician, but they that are sick: I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance. And the disciples of John and of the Pharisees used to fast: and they come and say unto him, Why do the disciples of John and of the Pharisees fast, but thy disciples fast not? And Jesus said unto them, Can the children of the bridechamber fast, while the bridegroom is with them? As long as they have the bridegroom with them, they cannot fast. But the days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then shall they fast in those days. No man also seweth a piece of new cloth on an old garment: else the new piece that filled it up taketh away from the old, and the rent is made worse. And no man putteth new wine into old bottles:

* Mark, chap. ii. 15.

Digitized by Google

else the new wine doth burst the bottles, and the wine is spilled, and the bottles will be marred: but new wine must be put into new bottles.

And it came to pass, that he went through the corn-fields on the Sabbath-day; and his disciples began, as they went, to pluck the ears of corn. And the Pharisees said unto him, Behold, why do they on the Sabbath-day that which is not lawful? And he said unto them, Have ye never read what David did, when he had need, and was an hungered, he, and they that were with him? How he went into the house of God in the days of Abiather the High Priest, and did eat the shew-bread, which is not lawful to eat but for the Priests, and gave also to them which were with him? And he said unto them, The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath: therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath.

* There came then his brethren and his mother, and, standing without, sent unto him, calling him. And the multitude sat about him, and they said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren without seek for thee. And he answered them, saying, Who is my mother, or my brethren? And he looked round about on them, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and my sister, and mother.

† And he taught them many things by parables, and said unto them in his doctrine, Hearken; Be-

* Mark, chap. iii. 31. † Mark, chap. iv. 2.

Digitized by Google

hold, there went out a sower to sow: and it came to pass, as he sowed, some fell by the way side, and the fowls of the air came and devoured it up. And some fell on stony ground, where it had not much earth: and immediately it sprang up, because it had no depth of earth: but when the sun was up, it was scorched; and because it had no root, it withered away. And some fell among thorns, and the thorns grew up, and choked it, and it yielded no fruit. And other fell on good ground, and did yield fruit that sprang up and increased: and brought forth, some thirty, and some sixty, and some an hundred. And he said unto them, He that hath ears to hear, let him hear. And when he was alone, they that were about him with the twelve asked of him the parable. And he said unto them, Unto you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God: but unto them that are without, all *these* things are done in parables: That seeing they may see, and not perceive; and hearing they may hear, and not understand; lest at any time they should be converted, and *their* sins should be forgiven them. And he said unto them, Know ye not this parable? and how then will ye know all parables? The sower soweth the word. And these are they by the way side, where the word is sown; but when they have heard, Satan cometh immediately, and taketh away the word that was sown in their hearts. And these are they likewise which are sown on stony ground; who, when they have

Digitized by Google

heard the word, immediately receive it with gladness: and have no root in themselves, and so endure but for a time: afterward, when affliction or persecution ariseth for the word's sake, immediately they are offended. And these are they which are sown among thorns; such as hear the word, and the cares of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches, and the lusts of other things entering in, choke the word, and it becometh unfruitful. And these are they which are sown in good ground; such as hear the word, and receive *it*, and bring forth fruit, some thirtyfold, some sixty, and some an hundred. And he said unto them, Is a candle brought to be put under a bushel, or under a bed, and not to be set on a candlestick? For there is nothing hid, which shall not be manifested; neither was any thing kept secret, but that it should come abroad. If any man have ears to hear, let him hear. And he saith unto them, Take heed what ye hear: with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you: and unto you that hear shall more be given. For he that hath, to him shall be given: and he that hath not, from him shall be taken even that which he hath. And he said, So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed into the ground; and should sleep, and rise night and day, and the seed should spring and grow up, he knoweth not how. For the earth bringeth forth fruit of herself; first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear. But when the fruit is brought forth, im-

Digitized by Google

mediately he putteth in the sickle, because the harvest is come. And he said, Whereunto shall we liken the kingdom of God? or with what comparison shall we compare it? *It is* like a grain of mustard seed, which, when it is sown in the earth, is less than all the seeds that be in the earth: but when it is sown, it groweth up, and becometh greater than all the herbs, and shooteth out great branches; so that the fowls of the air may lodge under the shadow of it.

* Then the Pharisees and Scribes asked him, Why walk not thy disciples according to the tradition of the elders, but eat bread with unwashen hands? He answered and said unto them, Well hath Esaias prophesied of you hypocrites, as it is written, This people honoureth me with *their* lips, but their heart is far from me. Howbeit, in vain do they worship me, teaching *for* doctrines the commandments of men. For, laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men, *as* the washing of pots and cups: and many other such like things ye do. And he said unto them, Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition. For Moses said, Honour thy father and thy mother, and, Whoso curseth father or mother, let him die the death: but ye say, If a man shall say to his father or mother, *It is* Corban, that is to say, a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profitted by me; *he shall be free.* And ye suffer him no more

* Mark, chap. vii. [5.] 6.

Digitized by Google

to do aught for his father or his mother; making the word of God of none effect through your tradition, which ye have delivered: and many such like things do ye. And when he had called all the people *unto him*, he said unto them, Hearken unto me every one *of you*, and understand: there is nothing from without a man, that entering into him can defile him: but the things which come out of him, those are they that defile the man. If any man have ears to hear, let him hear. And when he was entered into the house from the people, his disciples asked him concerning the parable. And he saith unto them, Are ye so without understanding also? Do ye not perceive, that whatsoever thing from without entereth into the man, *it* cannot defile him; because it entereth not into his heart, but into the belly, and goeth out into the draught, purging all meats! And he said, That which cometh out of the man, that defileth the man. For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness: all these evil things come from within, and defile the man.

* And when he had called the people *unto him*, with his disciples also, he said unto them, Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; but whoso-

* Mark, chap. viii. 34.

Digitized by Google

ever shall lose his life for my sake and the Gospel's, the same shall save it. For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul? Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation; of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels.

* And he came to Capernaum: and being in the house he asked them, What was it that ye disputed among yourselves by the way? But they held their peace: for by the way they had disputed among themselves, who *should be* the greatest. And he sat down, and called the twelve, and saith unto them, If any man desire to be first, *the same* shall be last of all, and servant of all. And he took a child, and set him in the midst of them: and when he had taken him into his arms, he said unto them, Whosoever shall receive one of such children in my name, receiveth me: and whosoever shall receive me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me.

And John answered him, saying, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and he followeth not us: and we forbad him, because he followeth not us. But Jesus said, Forbid him not: for there is no man which shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me. For he that is not against us is on our part.

* Mark, chap. ix. 33.

Digitized by Google

whosoever shall give you a cup of water to drink in my name, because ye belong to Christ, verily I say unto you, he shall not lose his reward. And whosoever shall offend one of *these* little ones that believe in me, it is better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea. And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter halt into life, than having two feet to be cast into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out: it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire: where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. For every one shall be salted with fire, and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt. Salt *is* good; but if the salt have lost its saltness, wherewith will ye season it? Have salt in yourselves, and have peace one with another.

* And they brought young children to him, that he should touch them: and *his* disciples rebuked those that brought *them*. But when Jesus saw *it*, he was much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid

* Mark, chap. x. 13.

Digitized by Google

them not; for of such is the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein. And he took them up in his arms, put *his* hands upon them, and blessed them.

And when he was gone forth into the way, there came one running, and kneeled to him, and asked him, Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life? And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? *there is* none good but one, *that is*, God. Thou knowest the commandments, Do not commit adultery, Do not kill, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Defraud not, Honour thy father and mother. And he answered and said unto him, Master, all these have I observed from my youth. Then Jesus beholding him loved him, and said unto him, One thing thou lackest: go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, take up the cross, and follow me. And he was sad at that saying, and went away grieved: for he had great possessions. And Jesus looked round about, and saith unto his disciples, How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God! And the discip leswer e astonished at his words. But Jesus answereth again, and saith unto them, Children, how hard is it for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God! It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God. And they

Digitized by Google

were astonished out of measure, saying among themselves, Who then can be saved? And Jesus looking upon them saith, With men *it is* impossible, but not with God: for with God all things are possible. Then Peter began to say unto him, Lo, we have left all, and have followed thee. And Jesus answered and said, Verily I say unto you, There is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my sake, and the gospel's, but he shall receive an hundredfold now in this time, houses, and brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, with persecutions; and in the world to come eternal life. But many *that are* first shall be last; and the last first.

* And James and John, the sons of Zebedee, come unto him, saying, Master, we would that thou shouldest do for us whatsoever we shall desire. And he said unto them, What would ye that I should do for you? They said unto him, Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and the other on thy left hand, in thy glory. But Jesus said unto them, Ye know not what ye ask: can ye drink of the cup that I drink of? and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? And they said unto him, We can. And Jesus said unto them, Ye shall indeed drink of the cup that I drink of; and with the baptism that I am baptized with shall ye be baptized: but to sit on my right hand and on my left hand is not

* Mark, chap, x. 35.

Digitized by Google

mine to give; but *it shall be given to them* for whom it is prepared. And when the ten heard *it*, they began to be much displeased with James and John. But Jesus called them *to him*, and saith unto them, Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them. But so shall it not be among you: but whosoever will be great among you, shall be your minister: and whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all. For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.

* Therefore I say unto you, What things soever ye desire, when ye pray, believe that ye receive *them*, and ye shall have *them*. And when ye stand praying, forgive, if ye have aught against any: that your Father also which is in heaven may forgive you your trespasses. But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses.

† And they send unto him certain of the Pharisees and of the Herodians, to catch him in *his* words. And when they were come, they say unto him, Master, we know that thou art true, and carest for no man: for thou regardest not the person of men, but teachest the way of God in truth: Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæsar, or not? Shall we give, or shall we not give? But he, knowing their hypocrisy, said unto them, Why tempt ye

* Mark, chap. xi. 24. † Mark, chap. xii. 13.

Digitized by Google

me? Bring me a penny, that I may see *it*. And they brought *it*. And he saith unto them, Whose *is* this image and superscription? And they said unto him, Cæsar's. And Jesus answering said unto them, Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's. And they marvelled at him. Then come unto him the Sadducees, which say there is no resurrection: and they asked him, saying, Master, Moses wrote unto us, If a man's brother die, and leave *his* wife *behind him*, and leave no children, that his brother should take his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. Now there were seven brethren: and the first took a wife, and dying left no seed. And the second took her, and died, neither left he any seed: and the third likewise. And the seven had her, and left no seed: last of all the woman died also. In the resurrection, therefore, when they shall rise, whose wife shall she be of them? for the seven had her to wife. And Jesus answering said unto them, Do ye not therefore err, because ye know not the Scriptures, neither the power of God? For when they shall rise from the dead, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage; but are as the angels which are in heaven. And as touching the dead, that they rise: have ye not read in the book of Moses, how in the bush God spake unto him, saying, I *am* the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? He is not the God of the dead, but the God of the living: ye therefore do

Digitized by Google

greatly err. And one of the Scribes came, and having heard them reasoning together, and perceiving that he had answered them well, asked him, Which is the first commandment of all? And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments *is*, Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord: and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this *is* the first commandment. And the second *is* like, *namely* this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these. And the Scribe said unto him, Well, Master, thou hast said the truth: for there is one God; and there is none other but he: and to love him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love *his* neighbour as himself, is more than all whole-burnt offerings and sacrifices. And when Jesus saw that he answered discreetly, he said unto him, Thou art not far from the kingdom of God. And no man after that durst ask him *any questions*.

* And Jesus sat over against the treasury, and beheld how the people cast money into the treasury: and many that were rich cast in much. And there came a certain poor widow, and she threw in two mites, which make a farthing. And he called *unto him* his disciples, and saith unto them, Verily I say unto you, That this poor widow hath

* Mark, chap. xi. [xii.] 41.

Digitized by Google

cast more in, than all they which have cast into the treasury: for all *they* did cast in of their abundance; but she of her want did cast in all that she had, *even* all her living.

* And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the sabbath-day, and stood up for to read. And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esaias. And when he had opened the book, he found the place where it was written, The Spirit of the Lord *is* upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. And he closed the book, and he gave *it* again to the minister, and sat down. And the eyes of all them that were in the synagogue were fastened on him. And he began to say unto them, This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears. And all bare him witness, and wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth. And they said, Is not this Joseph's son? And he said unto them, Ye will surely say unto me this proverb, Physician, heal thyself: whatsoever we have heard done in Capernaum, do also here in thy country. And he said, Verily I say unto you, No prophet is accepted in his own country. But I tell you of a truth,

* Luke, chap. iv. 16.

Digitized by Google

many widows were in Israel in the days of Elias, when the heaven was shut up three years and six months, when great famine was throughout all the land: but unto none of them was Elias sent, save unto Sarepta, *a city* of Sidon, unto a woman *that was* a widow. And many lepers were in Israel in the time of Eliseus the prophet; and none of them was cleansed saving Naaman the Syrian.

* But their Scribes and Pharisees murmured against his disciples, saying, Why do ye eat and drink with publicans and sinners? And Jesus answering said unto them, they that are whole need not a physician; but they that are sick. I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance. And he spake also a parable unto them; No man putteth a piece of a new garment upon an old; if otherwise, then both the new maketh a rent, and the piece that was *taken* out of the new agreeth not with the old. And no man putteth new wine into old bottles; else the new wine will burst the bottles, and be spilled, and the bottles shall perish. But new wine must be put into new bottles; and both are preserved. No man also having drunk old *wine* straightway desireth new: for he saith, The old is better.

† And it came to pass on the second Sabbath after the first, that he went through the corn fields; and his disciples plucked the ears of corn, and did eat, rubbing *them* in *their* hands. And certain

* Luke, chap. vi. [v.] 30. † Luke, chap. vi. 1.

Digitized by Google

of the Pharisees said unto them, Why do ye that which is not lawful to do on the sabbath-days? And Jesus answering them said, Have ye not read so much as this, what David did, when himself was an hungered, and they which were with him; how he went into the house of God, and did take and eat the shew-bread, and gave also to them that were with him; which it is not lawful to eat but for the Priests alone? And he said unto them, That the Son of man is Lord also of the sabbath.

And it came to pass also on another sabbath, that he entered into the synagogue and taught: and there was a man whose right hand was withered. And the Scribes and Pharisees watched him, whether he would heal on the sabbath-day; that they might find an accusation against him. But he knew their thoughts, and said to the man which had the withered hand, Rise up and stand forth in the midst. And he arose and stood forth. Then said Jesus unto them, I will ask you one thing; Is it lawful on the sabbath-day to do good, or to do evil? to save life, or to destroy *it?*

* And he lifted up his eyes on his disciples, and said, Blessed *be ye* poor: for yours is the kingdom of God. Blessed *are ye that* hunger now: for ye shall be filled. Blessed *are ye* that weep now: for ye shall laugh. Blessed are ye, when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you *from their company,* and shall reproach *you,* and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of man's sake.

* Luke, chap. vi. 20.

Digitized by Google

Rejoice ye in that day, and leap for joy: for, behold, your reward *is* great in heaven: for in the like manner did their fathers unto the prophets. But wo unto you that are rich! for ye have received your consolation. Wo unto you that are full! for ye shall hunger. Wo unto you that laugh now! for ye shall mourn and weep. Wo unto you, when all men shall speak well of you! for so did their fathers to the false prophets. But I say unto you which hear, Love your enemies, do good to them which hate you, bless them that curse you, and pray for them which despitefully use you. And unto him that smiteth thee on the *one* cheek, offer also the other; and him that taketh away thy cloak, forbid not *to take thy* coat also. Give to every man that asketh of thee; and of him that taketh away thy goods, ask *them* not again. And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise. For if ye love them which love you, what thank have ye? for sinners also love those that love them. And if ye do good to them which do good to you, what thank have ye? for sinners also do even the same. And if ye lend *to them* of whom ye hope to receive, what thank have ye? for sinners also lend to sinners, to receive as much again. But love ye your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the children of the Highest: for he is kind unto the unthankful and *to* the evil. Be ye therefore merciful, as your Fa-

Digitized by Google

ther also is merciful. Judge not, and ye shall not be judged : condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned : forgive, and ye shall be forgiven : give, and it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed down, and shaken together, and running over, shall men give into your bosom. For with the same measure that ye mete withal, it shall be measured to you again. And he spake a parable unto them, Can the blind lead the blind? shall they not both fall into the ditch? The disciple is not above his master : but every one that is perfect shall be as his master. And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but perceivest not the beam that is in thine own eye? Either how canst thou say to thy brother, Brother, let me pull out the mote that is in thine eye, when thou thyself beholdest not the beam that is in thine own eye? Thou hypocrite! cast out first the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to pull out the mote that is in thy brother's eye. For a good tree bringeth not forth corrupt fruit; neither doth a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. For every tree is known by its own fruit. For of thorns men do not gather figs, nor of a bramble bush gather they grapes. A good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is good; and an evil man out of the evil treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is evil: for of the abundance of the heart his mouth speaketh. And why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say? Whosoever

Digitized by Google

cometh to me, and heareth my sayings, and doeth them, I will show you to whom he is like: he is like a man which built an house, and digged deep, and laid the foundation on a rock: and when the flood arose, the stream beat vehemently upon that house, and could not shake it: for it was founded upon a rock. But he that heareth and doeth not, is like a man that without a foundation built an house upon the earth; against which the stream did beat vehemently, and immediately it fell; and the ruin of that house was great.

* And one of the Pharisees desired him that he would eat with him. And he went into the Pharisee's house, and sat down to meat. And, behold, a woman in the city, which was a sinner, when she knew that *Jesus* sat at meat in the Pharisee's house, brought an alabaster box of ointment, and stood at his feet behind *him* weeping, and began to wash his feet with tears, and did wipe *them* with the hairs of her head, and kissed his feet, and anointed *them* with the ointment. Now when the Pharisee which had bidden him saw *it*, he spake within himself, saying, This man, if he were a prophet, would have known who and what manner of woman *this is* that toucheth him; for she is a sinner. And Jesus answering said unto him, Simon, I have somewhat to say unto thee. And he saith, Master, say on. There was a certain creditor which had two debtors: the one owed five hundred pence, and the other fifty. And

* Luke, chap. vii. 36.

Digitized by Google

when they had nothing to pay, he frankly forgave them both. Tell me, therefore, which of them will love him most? Simon answered and said, I suppose that *he* to whom he forgave most. And he said unto him, Thou hast rightly judged. And he turned to the woman, and said unto Simon, Seest thou this woman? I entered into thine house, thou gavest me no water for my feet: but she hath washed my feet with tears, and wiped *them* with the hairs of her head. Thou gavest me no kiss: but this woman since the time I came in has not ceased to kiss my feet. Mine head with oil thou didst not anoint: but this woman hath anointed my feet with ointment. Wherefore I say unto thee, Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much: but to whom little is forgiven, *the same* loveth little. And he said unto her, thy sins are forgiven. And they that sat at meat with him, began to say within themselves, Who is this that forgiveth sins also? And he said to the woman, Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace.

* And when much people were gathered together, and were come to him out of every city, he spake by a parable: A sower went out to sow his seed: and as he sowed, some fell by the way side; and it was trodden down, and the fowls of the air devoured it. And some fell upon a rock; and as soon as it was sprung up, it withered away, because it lacked moisture. And some fell among

* Luke, chap. viii. 4.

Digitized by Google

thorns : and the thorns sprang up with it, and choked it. And others fell on good ground, and sprang up, and bare fruit an hundredfold. And when he [had] said these things, he cried, He that hath ears to hear, let him hear. And his disciples asked him, saying, What might this parable be? And he said, Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God : but to others in parables ; that seeing they might not see, and hearing they might not understand. Now the parable is this: The seed is the word of God. Those by the way side are they that hear; then cometh the devil, and taketh the word out of their hearts, lest they should believe and be saved. They on the rock *are they*, which when they hear, receive the word with joy ; and these have no root, which for a while believe, and in time of temptations fall away. And that which fell among thorns are they, which, when they have heard, go forth, and are choked with cares and riches and pleasures of *this* life, and bring no fruit to perfection. But that on the good ground are they, which in an honest and good heart, having heard the word, keep *it*, and bring forth fruit with patience. No man, when he hath lighted a candle, covereth it with a vessel, or putteth *it* under a bed ; but setteth *it* on a candlestick, that they which enter in may see the light. For nothing is secret, that shall not be made manifest ; neither *any thing* hid, that shall not be known and come abroad. Take heed therefore how ye hear : for whosoever

Digitized by Google

hath, to him shall be given ; and whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken even that which he seemeth to have.

Then came to him *his* mother and his brethren, and could not come at him for the press. And it was told him *by certain* which said, Thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to see thee. And he answered and said unto them, My mother and my brethren are these which hear the word of God and do it.

* Then there arose a reasoning among them, which of them should be greatest. And Jesus, perceiving the thought of their heart, took a child, and set him by him, and said unto them, Whosoever shall receive this child in my name receiveth me: and whosoever shall receive me, receiveth him that sent me : for he that is least among you all, the same shall be great. And John answered and said, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name ; and we forbad him, because he followeth not with us. And Jesus said unto him, Forbid *him* not : for he that is not against us, is for us.

And it came to pass, when the time was come that he should be received up, he steadfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem, and sent messengers before his face : and they went, and entered into a village of the Samaritans, to make ready for him. And they did not receive him, because his face was as though he would go to Jerusalem. And when his disciples James and John saw *this*, they said,

* Luke, chap. ix. 46.

Digitized by Google

Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them, even as Elias did? But he turned, and rebuked them, and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save *them*. And they went to another village.

And it came to pass, that, as they went in the way, a certain *man* said unto him, Lord, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest. And Jesus said unto him, Foxes have holes, and birds of the air *have* nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay *his* head. And he said unto another, Follow me. But he said, Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my father. Jesus said unto him, Let the dead bury their dead: but go thou and preach the kingdom of God. And another also said, Lord, I will follow thee; but let me first go bid them farewell, which are at home at my house. And Jesus said unto him, No man having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God.

* After these things, the Lord appointed other seventy also, and sent them two and two before his face into every city and place, whither he himself would come. Therefore, said he unto them, The harvest truly *is* great, but the labourers *are* few: pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he would send forth labourers into his harvest. Go your ways: behold, I send you forth as lambs

* Luke, chap. x. 1.

among wolves. Carry neither purse, nor scrip, nor shoes : and salute no man by the way. And into whatsoever house ye enter, first say, Peace *be* to this house. And if the son of peace be there, your peace shall rest upon it : if not, it shall turn to you again. And in the same house remain, eating and drinking such things as they give : for the labourer is worthy of his hire. Go not from house to house. And into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you, eat such things as are set before you : and heal the sick that are therein, and say unto them, the kingdom of God is come nigh unto you. But into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you not, go your ways out into the streets of the same, and say, Even the very dust of your city, which cleaveth on us, we do wipe off against you : notwithstanding, be ye sure of this, that the kingdom of God is come nigh unto you. But I say unto you, that it shall be more tolerable in that day for Sodom, than for that city. Wo unto thee, Chorazin ! wo unto thee, Bethsaida ! for if the mighty works had been done in Tyre and Sidon, which have been done in you, they had a great while ago repented, sitting in sackcloth and ashes. But it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the judgment, than for you. And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted to heaven, shalt be thrust down to hell. He that heareth you, heareth me ; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me ; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me.

Digitized by Google

* And, behold, a certain Lawyer stood up, and tempted him, saying, Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? He said unto him, What is written in the law? how readest thou? And he answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself. And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right: this do, and thou shalt live. But he, willing to justify himself, said unto Jesus, And who is my neighbour? And Jesus answering said, A certain *man* went down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and fell among thieves, which stripped him of his raiment, and wounded *him*, and departed, leaving *him* half dead. And by chance there came down a certain Priest that way: and when he saw him, he passed by on the other side. And likewise a Levite, when he was at the place, came and looked *on him*, and passed by on the other side. But a certain Samaritan, as he journeyed, came where he was: and when he saw him, he had compassion *on him*, and went to *him*, and bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine, and set him on his own beast, and brought him to an inn, and took care of him. And on the morrow when he departed, he took out two pence, and gave *them* to the host, and said unto him, Take care of him; and whatsoever thou spendest more, when I come again, I will repay thee. Which now of these three, thinkest thou, was

* Luke, chap. x. 25.

Digitized by Google

neighbour unto him that fell among the thieves? And he said, He that showed mercy on him. Then said Jesus unto him, Go, and do thou likewise.

* Now it came to pass, as they went, that he entered into a certain village: and a certain woman named Martha, received him into her house. And she had a sister called Mary, which also sat at Jesus' feet, and heard his word. But Martha was cumbered about much serving, and came to him, and said, Lord, dost thou not care that my sister hath left me to serve alone? Bid her therefore that she help me. And Jesus answered and said unto her, Martha, Martha, thou art careful and troubled about many things: but one thing is needful: and Mary hath chosen that good part, which shall not be taken away from her.

† And it came to pass, that, as he was praying in a certain place, when he ceased, one of his disciples said unto him, Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples. And he said unto them, When ye pray, say, Our father which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth. Give us day by day our daily bread. And forgive us our sins; for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us. And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil. And he said unto them, Which of you shall have a friend, and shall go unto him at midnight, and say unto him,

* Luke, chap. x. 38. † Luke, chap. xi. 1.

Digitized by Google

Friend, lend me three loaves: for a friend of mine in his journey is come to me, and I have nothing to set before him? And he from within shall answer and say, Trouble me not: the door is now shut, and my children are with me in bed; I cannot rise and give thee. I say unto you, Though he will not rise and give him, because he is his friend, yet because of his importunity he will rise and give him as many as he needeth. And I say unto you, Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you. For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh, it shall be opened. If a son shall ask bread of any of you that is a father, will he give him a stone? Or if *he ask* a fish will he for a fish give him a serpent? Or if he shall ask an egg, will he offer him a scorpion? If ye, then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children how much more shall *your* heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him!

* And it came to pass, as he spake these things, a certain woman of the company lifted up her voice, and said unto him, Blessed *is* the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked. But he said, Yea, rather blessed *are* they that hear the word of God and keep it.

† No man, when he hath lighted a candle, putteth *it* in a secret place, neither under a bushel, but on a candlestick, that they which come in may

* Luke, chap. xi. 27. † Luke, chap. xi. 33.

Digitized by Google

see the light. The light of the body is the eye: therefore when thine eye is single, thy whole body also is full of light; but when *thine eye* is evil, thy body also *is* full of darkness. Take heed therefore that the light that is in thee be not darkness. If thy whole body therefore *be* full of light, having no part dark, the whole shall be full of light, as when the bright shining of a candle doth give the light.

And as he speak, a certain Pharisee besought him to dine with him: and he went in, and sat down to meat. And when the Pharisee saw *it*, he marvelled that he had not first washed before dinner. And the Lord said unto him, Now do ye Pharisees make clean the outside of the cup and the platter; but your inward part is full of ravening and wickedness. *Ye* fools, did not he that made that which is without, make that which is within also? But rather give alms of such things as you have; and, behold, all things are clean unto you. But wo unto you, Pharisees! for ye tithe mint and rue and all manner of herbs, and pass over judgment and the love of God: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone. Wo unto you, Pharisees! for ye love the uppermost seats in the synagogues, and greetings in the markets. Wo unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are as graves which appear not, and the men that walk over *them* are not aware *of them*. Then answered one of the Lawyers, and said unto him, Master, thus say-

Digitized by Google

ing, thou reproachest us also. And he said, Wo unto you also, *ye* Lawyers! for ye lade men with burdens grievous to be borne, and ye yourselves touch not the burdens with one of your fingers. Wo unto you! for ye build the sepulchres of the prophets, and your fathers killed them. Truly ye bear witness that ye allow the deeds of your fathers: for they indeed killed them, and ye build their sepulchres. Therefore also said the wisdom of God, I will send them prophets and apostles, and *some* of them they shall slay and persecute: that the blood of all the prophets, which was shed from the foundation of the world, may be required of this generation; from the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, which perished between the altar and the temple: Verily I say unto you, It shall be required of this generation. Wo unto you, Lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered.

* In the mean time, when there were gathered together an innumerable multitude of people, insomuch that they trode one upon another, he began to say unto his disciples first of all, Beware ye of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy. For there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; neither hid, that shall not be known. Therefore, whatsoever ye have spoken in darkness shall be heard in the light; and that which ye have spoken in the ear in closets, shall be pro-

* Luke, chap. xii. 1.

Digitized by Google

claimed upon the house-tops. And I say unto you, my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will forwarn you whom ye shall fear: Fear him, which after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear him. Are not five sparrows sold for two farthings? and not one of them is forgotten before God: but even the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear not, therefore: ye are of more value than many sparrows. Also I say unto you, Whosoever shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God: but he that denieth me before men, shall be denied before the angels of God. And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but unto him that blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven. And when they bring you unto the synagogues, and *unto* magistrates, and powers; take ye no thought how or what thing ye shall answer, or what ye shall say; for the Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what ye ought to say. And one of the company said unto him, Master, speak to my brother, that he divide the inheritance with me. And he said unto him, Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you? And he said unto them, Take heed, and beware of covetousness; for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth. And he spake a parable unto them.

Digitized by Google

saying, The ground of a certain rich man brought forth plentifully: and he thought within himself, saying, What shall I do, because I have no room where to bestow my fruits? And he said, This will I do: I will pull down my barns, and build greater; and there will I bestow all my fruits and my goods. And I will say to my soul, Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, drink *and* be merry. But God said unto him, *Thou* fool! this night thy soul shall be required of thee: then whose shall those things be, which thou hast provided? So *is* he that layeth up treasure for himself, and is not rich towards God. And he said unto his disciples, Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat; neither for the body, what ye shall put on. The life is more than meat, and the body *is more* than raiment. Consider the ravens: for they neither sow nor reap; which neither have storehouse nor barn; and God feedeth them: how much more are ye better than the fowls! And which of you with taking thought can add to his stature one cubit? If ye then be not able to do that thing which is least, why take ye thought for the rest? Consider the lilies how they grow: they toil not, they spin not: and yet I say unto you, that Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. If then God so clothe the grass, which is to-day in the field, and to-morrow is cast into the oven; how much more *will he clothe* you, O ye of little

Digitized by Google

faith ! And seek not ye what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink, neither be ye of doubtful mind. For all these things do the nations of the world seek after : and your Father knoweth that [ye] have need of these things. But rather seek ye the kingdom of God ; and all these things shall be added unto you. Fear not, little flock ; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom. Sell that ye have, and give alms ; provide yourselves bags which wax not old, a treasure in the heavens that faileth not, where no thief approacheth, neither moth corrupteth. For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also. Let your loins be girded about, and *your* lights burning ; and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their lord, when he will return from the wedding ; that when he cometh and knocketh, they may open unto him immediately. Blessed *are* those servants, whom the lord, when he cometh, shall find watching : verily I say unto you, that he shall gird himself, and make them to sit down to meat, and will come forth and serve them. And if he shall come in the second watch, or come in the third watch, and find *them* so, blessed are those servants. And this know, that if the good man of the house had known what hour the thief would come, he would have watched, and not have suffered his house to be broken through. Be ye therefore ready also : for the Son of man cometh at an hour, when ye think not. Then Peter said unto him, Lord, speakest thou

Digitized by Google

this parable unto us, or even to all? And the Lord said, Who then is that faithful and wise steward, whom *his* lord shall make ruler over his household, to give *them* *their* portion of meat in due season? Blessed *is* that servant, whom his lord, when he cometh, shall find so doing. Of a truth I say unto you, that he will make him ruler over all that he hath. But and if that servant say in his heart, My lord delayeth his coming; and shall begin to beat the men-servants and maidens, and to eat and drink, and to be drunken; the lord of that servant will come in a day when he looketh not for *him*, and at an hour when he is not aware, and will cut him in sunder, and will appoint him his portion with the unbelievers. And that servant, which knew his lord's will, and prepared not *himself*, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many *stripes*. But he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few *stripes*. For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required: and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more I am come to send fire on the earth: and what will I, if it be already kindled? but I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished! Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you, Nay; but rather division; for from henceforth there shall be five in one house divided, three against two, and two against three. The father shall be divided against

Digitized by Google

the son, and the son against the father; the mother against the daughter, and the daughter against the mother; the mother-in-law against her daughter-in-law, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. And he said also to the people, When ye see a cloud rise out of the west, straightway ye say, There cometh a shower; and so it is. And when *ye see* the south wind blow, ye say, There will be heat; and it cometh to pass. *Ye* hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky and of the earth; but how is it that ye do not discern this time? Yea, and why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right? When thou goest with thine adversary to the magistrate, *as thou art* in the way, give diligence that thou mayest be delivered from him; lest he hale thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and the officer cast thee into prison. I tell thee, thou shalt not depart thence, till thou hast paid the very last mite.

* There were present at that season some that told him of the Galileans, whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices. And Jesus answering said unto them, Suppose ye that these Galileans were sinners above all the Galileans, because they suffered such things? I tell you, Nay; but, except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish. Or those eighteen, upon whom the tower in Siloam fell, and slew them, think ye that they

* Luke, chap. xiii. 1.

Digitized by Google

were sinners above all men that dwelt in Jerusalem? I tell you, Nay: but, except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish. He spake also this parable: A certain *man* had a fig-tree planted in his vineyard: and he came and sought fruit thereon, and found none. Then said he unto the dresser of his vineyard, Behold, these three years I come seeking fruit on this fig-tree, and find none: cut it down; why cumbereth it the ground? And he answering said unto him, Lord, let it alone this year also, till I shall dig about it, and dung *it:* and if it bear fruit, *well:* and if not, *then* after that thou shalt cut it down.

* And the ruler of the synagogue answered with indignation, because that Jesus had healed on the sabbath-day, and said unto the people, There are six days in which men ought to work: in them therefore come and be healed, and not on the sabbath-day. The Lord then answered him, and said, *Thou* hypocrite! doth not each one of you on the sabbath loose his ox or *his* ass from the stall, and lead *him* away to watering? And ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years, to be loosed from this bond on the sabbath-day? And when he had said these things, all his adversaries were ashamed: and all the people rejoiced for all the glorious things that were done by him.

* Luke, chap. xiii. [14.] 17.

Digitized by Google

Then said he, Unto what is the kingdom of God like? and whereunto shall I resemble it? It is like a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and cast into his garden; and it grew, and waxed a great tree; and the fowls of the air lodged in the branches of it. And again he said, Whereunto shall I liken the kingdom of God? It is like leaven, which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened.

Then said one unto him, Lord, are there few that be saved? And he said unto them, Strive to enter in at the strait gate: for many, I say unto you, will seek to enter in, and shall not be able. When once the master of the house is risen up, and hath shut to the door, and ye begin to stand without, and to knock at the door, saying, Lord, Lord, open unto us; and he shall answer and say unto you, I know you not whence ye are: then shall ye begin to say, We have eaten and drunken in thy presence, and thou hast taught in our streets. But he shall say, I tell you, I know you not whence ye are; depart from me, all *ye* workers of iniquity. There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, in the kingdom of God, and you *yourselves* thrust out. And they shall come from the east, and *from* the west, and from the north, and *from* the south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God. And, behold, there are last which shall be first, and there are first which shall be last.

Digitized by Google

The same day there came certain of the Pharisees, saying unto him, Get thee out, and depart hence: for Herod will kill thee. And he said unto them, Go ye, and tell that fox, Behold, I cast out devils, and I do cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I shall be perfected. Nevertheless I must walk to-day, and to-morrow, and the *day* following: for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem. O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen *doth gather* her brood under *her* wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate: and verily I say unto you, Ye shall not see me, until *the time* come when ye shall say, Blessed *is* he that cometh in the name of the Lord.

* And it came to pass, as he went into the house of one of the chief Pharisees to eat bread on the sabbath-day, that they watched him. And, behold, there was a certain man before him which had the dropsy. And Jesus answering spake unto the Lawyers and Pharisees, saying, Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath-day? And they held their peace. And he took *him*, and he healed him, and let him go; and answered them, saying, Which of you shall have an ass or an ox fallen into a pit, and will not straightway pull him out on the sabbath-day? And they could not answer him again to these things. And he put forth a parable to

* Luke, chap. xiv. 1.

Digitized by Google

those which were bidden, when he marked how they chose out the chief rooms; saying unto them, When thou art bidden of any *man* to a wedding, sit not down in the highest room; lest a more honourable man than thou be bidden of him; and he that bade thee and him come and say to thee, Give this man place; and thou begin with shame to take the lowest room. But when thou art bidden, go and sit down in the lowest room; that when he that bade thee cometh, he may say unto thee, Friend, go up higher: then shalt thou have worship in the presence of them that sit at meat with thee. For whosoever exalteth himself shall be abased; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted. Then said he also to him that bade him, When thou makest a dinner or a supper, call not thy friends, nor thy brethren, neither thy kinsmen, nor *thy* rich neighbours; lest they also bid thee again, and a recompense be made thee. But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind: and thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee: for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just. And when one of them that sat at meat with him heard these things, he said unto him, Blessed *is* he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God. Then said he unto him, A certain man made a great supper, and bade many: and sent his servant at supper time to say to them that were bidden, Come; for all things are now ready. And they all with one *consent* began to make excuse. The first said unto him, I have

Digitized by Google

bought a piece of ground, and I must needs go and see it: I pray thee have me excused. And another said, I have bought five yoke of oxen, and I go to prove them: I pray thee have me excused. And another said, I have married a wife, and therefore I cannot come. So that servant came, and shewed his lord these things. Then the master of the house being angry, said to his servant, Go out quickly into the streets and lanes of the city, and bring in hither the poor, and the maimed, and the halt, and the blind. And the servant said, Lord, it is done as thou hast commanded, and yet there is room. And the Lord said unto the servant, Go out into the highways and hedges, and compel *them* to come in, that my house may be filled. For I say unto you, That none of those men which were bidden shall taste of my supper.

And there went great multitudes with him: and he turned, and said unto them, If any *man* come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple. And whosoever doth not bear his cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple. For which of you, intending to build a tower, sitteth not down first, and counteth the cost, whether he have *sufficient* to finish *it*? Lest haply, after he hath laid the foundation, and is not able to finish *it*, all that behold *it* begin to mock him, saying, This man began to build, and was not able to finish. Or what king, going to make war against another

Digitized by Google

king, sitteth not down first, and consulteth whether he be able with ten thousand to meet him that cometh against him with twenty thousand? Or else, while the other is yet a great way off, he sendeth an ambassage, and desireth conditions of peace. So likewise, whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple. Salt *is* good: but if the salt have lost its savour, wherewith shall it be seasoned? It is neither fit for the land, nor yet for the dunghill; *but* men cast it out. He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.

* Then drew near unto him all the publicans and sinners for to hear him. And the Pharisees and Scribes murmured, saying, This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them. And he spake this parable unto them, saying, What man of you, having an hundred sheep, if he lose one of them, doth not leave the ninety and nine in the wilderness, and go after that which is lost, until he find it? And when he hath found *it*, he layeth *it* on his shoulders, rejoicing. And when he cometh home, he calleth together *his* friends and neighbours, saying unto them, Rejoice with me; for I have found my sheep which was lost. I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons which need no repentance. Either what woman having ten pieces of silver, if she lose one piece, doth not light a candle, and sweep

* Luke, chap. xv. 1.

Digitized by Google

the house, and seek diligently till she find *it?* And when she hath found *it*, she calleth *her* friends and *her* neighbours together, saying, Rejoice with me; for I have found the piece which I had lost. Likewise, I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth. And he said, A certain man had two sons: and the younger of them said to *his* father, Father, give me the portion of goods that falleth *to me.* And he divided unto them *his* living. And not many days after the younger son gathered all together, and took his journey into a far country, and there wasted his substance with riotous living. And when he had spent all, there arose a mighty famine in that land; and he began to be in want. And he went and joined himself to a citizen of that country; and he sent him into his fields to feed swine. And he would fain have filled his belly with the husks that the swine did eat: and no man gave unto him. And when he came to himself, he said, How many hired servants of my father's have bread enough and to spare, and I perish with hunger! I will arise and go to my father, and will say unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and before thee, and am no more worthy to be called thy son: make me as one of thy hired servants. And he arose, and came to his father. But when he was yet a great way off, his father saw him, and had compassion, and ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him. And the son said unto him, Father, I have

Digitized by Google

sinned against heaven, and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son. But the father said to his servants, Bring forth the best robe, and put *it* on him; and put a ring on his hand, and shoes on *his* feet: and bring hither the fatted calf, and kill *it*; and let us eat, and be merry: for this my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found. And they began to be merry. Now his elder son was in the field: and as he came and drew nigh to the house, he heard music and dancing. And he called one of the servants, and asked what these things meant. And he said unto him, Thy brother is come; and thy father hath killed the fatted calf, because he hath received him safe and sound. And he was angry, and would not go in: therefore came his father out, and entreated him. And he answering said to *his* father, Lo, these many years do I serve thee, neither transgressed I at any time thy commandment: and yet thou never gavest me a kid, that I might make merry with my friends: but as soon as this thy son was come, which hath devoured thy living with harlots, thou hast killed for him the fatted calf. And he said unto him, Son, thou art ever with me, and all that I have is thine. It was meet that we should make merry, and be glad: for this thy brother was dead, and is alive again; and was lost, and is found.

* And he said also unto his disciples, There

* Luke, chap. xiii. [xvi.] 1.

Digitized by Google

was a certain rich man, which had a steward; and the same was accused unto him that he had wasted his goods. And he called him, and said unto him, How is it that I hear this of thee? give an account of thy stewardship; for thou mayest be no longer steward. Then the steward said within himself, What shall I do, for my lord taketh away from me the stewardship? I cannot dig; to beg I am ashamed. I am resolved what to do, that, when I am put out of the stewardship, they may receive me into their houses. So he called every one of his lord's debtors *unto him*, and said unto the first, How much owest thou unto my lord? And he said, An hundred measures of oil. And he said unto him, Take thy bill, and sit down quickly, and write fifty. Then said he to another, And how much owest thou? And he said, An hundred measures of wheat. And he said unto him, Take thy bill, and write fourscore. And the lord commended the unjust steward, because he had done wisely: for the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light. And I say unto you, Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness: that, when ye fail, they may receive you unto everlasting habitations. He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much: and he that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much. If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust the true *riches*? And if ye have not been faithful in

Digitized by Google

that which is another man's, who shall give you that which is your own? No servant can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon. And the Pharisees also, who were covetous, heard all these things: and they derided him. And he said unto them, Ye are they which justify yourselves before men; but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is highly esteemed amongst men is abomination in the sight of God. The Law and the Prophets *were* until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it. And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail. Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from *her* husband, committeth adultery. There was a certain rich man, which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day: and there was a certain beggar named Lazarus, which was laid at his gate, full of sores, and desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table: moreover the dogs came and licked his sores. And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom: the rich man also died, and was buried; and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried and said,

Digitized by Google

Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame. But Abraham said, Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things: but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented. And besides all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed: so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us, that *would come* from thence. Then he said, I pray thee therefore, father, that thou wouldest send him to my father's house: for I have five brethren; that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment. Abraham saith unto him, They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them. And he said, Nay, father Abraham: but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent. And he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.

* Then said he unto the disciples, It is impossible but that offences will come: but wo *unto him* through whom they come! It were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he cast into the sea, than that he should offend one of these little ones. Take heed to yourselves: If thy brother trespass against thee, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him. And

* Luke, chap. xvii. 1.

Digitized by Google

if he trespass against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turn again to thee, saying, I repent; thou shalt forgive him. And the Apostles said unto the Lord, Increase our faith. And the Lord said, If ye had faith as a grain of mustard-seed, ye might say unto this sycamine-tree, Be thou plucked up by the root, and be thou planted in the sea; and it should obey you. But which of you, having a servant ploughing or feeding cattle, will say unto him by and by, when he is come from the field, Go and sit down to meat? and will not rather say unto him, Make ready wherewith I may sup, and gird thyself, and serve me, till I have eaten and drunken; and afterward thou shalt eat and drink? Doth he thank that servant because he did the things that were commanded him? I trow not. So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do.

* And he spake a parable unto them *to this end*, that men ought always *to* pray, and not to faint: saying, There was in a city a judge, which feared not God, neither regarded man: and there was a widow in that city: and she came unto him, saying, Avenge me of mine adversary. And he would not for a while: but afterward he said within himself, Though I fear not God, nor regard man; yet because this widow troubleth me, I will avenge her, lest by her continual coming she

* Luke, chap. xviii. 1.

Digitized by Google

weary me. And the Lord said, Hear what the unjust judge saith. And shall not God avenge his own elect, which cry day and night unto him, though he bear long with them? I tell you that he will avenge them speedily. Nevertheless when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?

And he spake this parable unto certain which trusted in themselves that they were righteous, and despised others: Two men went up into the temple to pray; the one a Pharisee, and the other a Publican. The Pharisee stood and prayed thus with himself: God, I thank thee, that I am not as other men *are*, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this Publican. I fast twice in the week, I give tithes of all that I possess. And the Publican, standing afar off, would not lift up so much as *his* eyes unto heaven, but smote upon his breast, saying, God be merciful to me a sinner. I tell you, this man went down to his house justified *rather* than the other: for every one that exalteth himself shall be abased; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.

And they brought unto him also infants, that he would touch them: but when *his* disciples saw *it*, they rebuked them. But Jesus called them *unto him*, and said, Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child shall in no wise enter therein.

Digitized by Google

And a certain ruler asked him, saying, Good Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? none *is* good, save one, *that is*, God. Thou knowest the commandments, Do not commit adultery, Do not kill, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Honour thy father and thy mother. And he said, All these have I kept from my youth up. Now when Jesus heard these things, he said unto him, Yet lackest thou one thing: sell all that thou hast, and distribute unto the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, follow me. And when he heard this, he was very sorrowful: for he was very rich. And when Jesus saw that he was very sorrowful, he said, How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God! For it is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God. And they that heard *it* said, Who then can be saved? And he said, The things which are impossible with men are possible with God. Then Peter said, Lo, we have left all, and followed thee. And he said unto them, Verily I say unto you, There is no man that hath left house, or parents, or brethren, or wife, or children, for the kingdom of God's sake, who shall not receive manifold more in this present time, and in the world to come life everlasting.

* He said therefore, A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a king-

* Luke, chap. xix. 12.

Digitized by Google

dom, and to return. And he called his ten servants, and delivered them ten pounds, and said unto them, Occupy till I come. But his citizens hated him, and sent a message after him, saying, We will not have this *man* to reign over us. And it came to pass, that when he was returned, having received the kingdom, then he commanded these servants to be called unto him, to whom he had given the money, that he might know how much every man had gained by trading. Then came the first, saying, Lord, thy pound hath gained ten pounds. And he said unto him, Well, thou good servant: because thou hast been faithful in a very little, have thou authority over ten cities. And the second came, saying, Lord, thy pound hath gained five pounds. And he said likewise to him, Be thou also over five cities. And another came, saying, Lord, behold, *here is* thy pound, which I have kept laid up in a napkin: for I feared thee, because thou art an austere man: thou takest up that thou layedst not down, and reapest that thou didst not sow. And he saith unto him, Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee, *thou* wicked servant. Thou knewest that I was an austere man, taking up that I laid not down, and reaping that I did not sow: wherefore then gavest not thou my money into the bank, that at my coming I might have required mine own with usury? And he said unto them that stood by, Take from him the pound, and give *it* to him that hath ten pounds. (And they said

Digitized by Google

unto him, Lord, he hath ten pounds.) For I say unto you, That unto every one which hath shall be given; and from him that hath not, even that he hath shall be taken away from him. But those mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay *them* before me.

* And the Chief Priests and the Scribes the same hour sought to lay hands on him; and they feared the people: for they perceived that he had spoken this parable against them. And they watched *him*, and sent forth spies, which should feign themselves just men, that they might take hold of his words, that so they might deliver him unto the power and authority of the governor. And they asked him, saying, Master, we know that thou sayest and teachest rightly, neither acceptest thou the person *of any*, but teachest the way of God truly: Is it lawful for us to give tribute unto Cæsar, or no? But he perceived their craftiness, and said unto them, Why tempt ye me? Show me a penny. Whose image and superscription hath it? They answered and said, Cæsar's. And he said unto them, Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which be Cæsar's, and unto God the things which be God's. And they could not take hold of his words before the people: and they marvelled at his answer, and held their peace. Then came to *him* certain of the Sadducees, which deny that there is any resurrection; and they asked him, saying, Master, Moses wrote unto us, If any

* Luke, chap. xx. [19.] 20.

Digitized by Google

man's brother die, having a wife, and he die without children, that his brother should take his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. There were therefore seven brethren: and the first took a wife, and died without children. And the second took her to wife, and he died childless. And the third took her; and in like manner the seven also: and they left no children, and died. Last of all the woman died also. Therefore in the resurrection whose wife of them is she? for seven had her to wife. And Jesus answering said unto them, The children of this world marry, and are given in marriage: but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage: neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection. Now that the dead are raised, even Moses shewed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For he is not a God of the dead, but of the living: for all live unto him. Then certain of the Scribes answering said, Master, thou hast well said.

* And he looked up, and saw the rich men casting their gifts into the treasury. And he saw also a certain poor widow casting in thither two mites. And he said, Of a truth I say unto you, that this poor widow hath cast in more than they all: for

* Luke, chap. xxi. 1.

Digitized by Google

all these have of their abundance cast in unto the offerings of God: but she of her penury hath cast in all the living that she had.

* There was a man of the Pharisees, named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews: the same came to Jesus by night, and said unto him, Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God: for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him. Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. Nicodemus saith unto him, How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born? Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and *of* the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again. The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit. Nicodemus answered and said unto him, How can these things be? Jesus answered and said unto him, Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things? Verily, verily, I say unto thee, We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen; and ye re-

* John, chap. iii. 1.

Digitized by Google

ceive not our witness. If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe, if I tell you *of* heavenly things? And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, *even* the Son of man which is in heaven. And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God. And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved. But he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God.

* But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God *is* a Spirit; and they that worship him must worship *him* in spirit and in truth.

* John, chap. iv. 23.

Digitized by Google

* Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto you; for him hath God the Father sealed.

† And the Scribes and Pharisees brought unto him a woman taken in adultery; and when they had set her in the midst, they say unto him, Master, this woman was taken in adultery, in the very act. Now Moses in the law commanded us, that such should be stoned: but what sayest thou? This they said, tempting him, that they might have to accuse him. But Jesus stooped down, and with *his* finger wrote on the ground, *as though he heard them not.* So when they continued asking him, he lifted up himself, and said unto them, He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her. And again he stooped down, and wrote on the ground. And they which heard *it,* being convicted by *their own* conscience, went out one by one, beginning at the eldest, *even* unto the last: and Jesus was left alone, and the woman standing in the midst. When Jesus had lifted up himself, and saw none but the woman, he said unto her, Woman, where are those thine accusers? Hath no man condemned thee? She said, No man, Lord. And Jesus said unto her, Neither do I condemn thee; go, and sin no more.

‡ And Jesus said, For judgment I am come into

* John, chap. vi. 27.
† John, chap. viii. 3.
‡ John, chap. ix. 39.

Digitized by Google

this world, that they which see not might see; and that they which see might be made blind. And *some* of the Pharisees which were with him heard these words, and said unto him, Are we blind also? Jesus said unto them, If ye were blind, ye should have no sin: but now ye say, We see; therefore your sin remaineth.

* I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away: and every *branch* that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit. Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you. Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye *are* the branches: he that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me ye can do nothing. If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast *them* into the fire, and they are burned. If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you. Herein is my father glorified, that ye bear much fruit; so shall ye be my disciples. As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you: continue ye in my love. If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments,

* John, chap. xv. 1.

Digitized by Google

and abide in his love. These things have I spoken unto you, that my joy might remain in you, and *that* your joy might be full. This is my commandment, That ye love one another, as I have loved you. Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends. Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you. Henceforth I call you not servants; for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth: but I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you. Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and *that* your fruit should remain: that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name, he may give it you. These things I command you, that ye love one another.

Digitized by Google

AN APPEAL TO THE CHRISTIAN PUBLIC,

IN DEFENCE OF THE

"PRECEPTS OF JESUS."

BY

A FRIEND TO TRUTH.

FROM THE LONDON EDITION.

NEW-YORK:
PUBLISHED BY B. BATES, 380 BROADWAY.

1825.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

AN APPEAL,

&c. &c.

In perusing the twentieth number of "The Friend of India," I felt as much surprised as disappointed at some remarks made in that magazine, by a gentleman under the signature of "A Christian Missionary," on a late publication, entitled, "The Precepts of Jesus;" and also at some observations of a similar nature on the same subject by the editor of that publication. Before, however, I attempt to inquire into the ground upon which their objections to the work in question are founded, I humbly beg to appeal to the public against the unchristianlike, as well as uncivil manner in which the Editor has adduced his objections to the compilation, by introducing personality, and applying the term of *heathen* to the Compiler. I say unchristianlike manner, because the Editor, by making use of the term heathen, has, I presume, violated truth, charity, and liberality, which are essential to Christianity in every sense of the word. For there are only two methods by which the character of the Compiler as a heathen, or as a believer in one true and living God, can be satisfactorily inferred. The most reasonable of the

Digitized by Google

two modes is to confine such inquiries to the evidence contained in the subject of review, no mention of the name of the Compiler being made in the publication itself. Another mode, which is obviously inapplicable in such discussions, is to guess at the real author, and to infer his opinions from a knowledge of his education or other circumstances. With respect to the first source of evidence, the following expressions of the Compiler's sentiments, are found in the Introduction. "A notion of the existence of a Supreme Superintending Power, the author and preserver of the harmonious system, who has organized, and who regulates such an infinity of celestial and terrestrial objects, and a due estimation of that law which teaches that man should do to others as he would wish to be done by, reconcile us to human nature," &c. "This simple code of religion and morality, (meaning the Precepts of Jesus,) is so admirably calculated to elevate men's ideas to high and liberal notions of one God," &c. "so well fitted to regulate the conduct of the human race in the discharge of their various duties to God, to themselves, and to society," and "so conformable to the dictates of human reason and divine revelation," &c. These expressions are calculated, in my humble opinion, to convince every mind not biassed by prejudice, that the Compiler believed not only in one God, whose nature and essence is beyond human comprehension, but in the truths revealed in the Christian system. I should

Digitized by Google

hope neither the Reviewer nor the Editor can be justified in inferring the heathenism of the Compiler, from the facts of his extracting and publishing the moral doctrines of the New Testament, under the title of "A Guide to Peace and Happiness" —his styling the Precepts of Jesus, a code of religion and morality—his believing God to be the author and preserver of the universe—or his considering those sayings as adapted to regulate the conduct of the whole human race in the discharge of all the duties required of them.

Neither, I trust, can his separating the moral sayings of Christ from the mysterious dogmas and historical parts of the New Testament, under the impression, that these are liable to the doubts and disputes of freethinkers and anti-christians, with which this part of the world is unfortunately filled; nor his opinion that this simple code of morality would be more likely to attract the notice and respect of such men, and to guide their minds into the paths of peace and happiness, than if presented to them in conjunction with other matter against which their education has taught them to revolt; justly subject him, in the opinion of the most orthodox Christians, to the epithet applied to him by the Editor. If they do, I cannot see how the same condemnation can be spared to numerous publications of extracts from the Old and the New Testaments, made and sent forth by several Christian authors, under various designations, and for different purposes.

Digitized by Google

With respect to the latter mode of seeking evidence, however unjustified the Editor may be in coming to such a conclusion, he is safe in ascribing the collection of these Precepts to Rammohun Roy; who, although he was born a Brahmun, not only renounced idolatry at a very early period of his life, but published at that time a treatise in Arabic and Persian against that system; and no sooner acquired a tolerable knowledge of English, than he made his desertion of idol worship known to the Christian world by his English publication—a renunciation that, I am sorry to say, brought severe difficulties upon him, by exciting the displeasure of his parents, and subjecting him to the dislike of his near, as well as distant relations, and to the hatred of nearly all his countrymen for several years. I therefore presume, that among his declared enemies, who are aware of those facts, no one who has the least pretension to truth, would venture to apply the designation of heathen to him; but I am sure, that the respect he entertains for the very name of Christianity, which the Editor of the Friend of India seems to profess, will restrain him from retorting on that Editor, although there may be differences of opinion between them, that might be thought sufficient to justify the use towards the Editor of a term no less offensive. The Editor perhaps may consider himself justified by numerous precedents amongst the several partisans of different Christian sects, in applying the name of

heathen to one who takes the Precepts of Jesus as his principal guide in matters of religious and civil duties; as Roman Catholics bestow the appellation of heretics or infidels on all classes of Protestants, and Protestants do not spare the title of idolators to Roman Catholics; Trinitarians deny the name of Christian to Unitarians, while the latter retort by stigmatizing the worshippers of the Son of man as Pagans, who adore a created and dependent Being. Very different conduct is inculcated in the precept of Jesus to John, when complaining of one who performed cures in the name of Jesus, yet refused to follow the apostles:—he gave a rebuke, saying, "He that is not against us is on our part:" *Mark*, ch. ix. ver. 40. The Compiler, having obviously in view at least one object in common with the Reviewer and Editor, that of procuring respect for the precepts of Christ, might have reasonably expected more charity from professed teachers of his doctrines.

The Compiler of the Precepts of Jesus, will, however, I doubt not, give preference to the guidance of those Precepts, which justify no retaliation even upon enemies, to the hasty suggestions of human passions, and the example of the Editor of the Friend of India.

2. The Editor of the Friend of India, and the respected Reviewer, both not only disapprove absolutely the plan adopted by the Compiler in separating the moral doctrines of the books of the

New Testament ascribed to the four Evangelists from the mysteries and historical matters therein contained, but even blame him as an injurer of the cause of truth; and for such disapprobation they assign several reasons: first, The Reviewer says, the supposition of the moral sayings being sufficient for salvation, independent of the dogmas, is, (as he notes in page 27,) radically false; and that it is presumption of him (the Compiler) to think himself qualified to judge, independently of the Divine Teacher, what sort of instruction is advantageous for the happiness of mankind. If, indeed, the Reviewer understands by the word *moral*, what relates to conduct only with reference to man, it cannot apply to those precepts of Jesus, that teach the duty of man to God; which, however, the Reviewer will find included in the collection of the Precepts of Jesus by the Compiler: but a slight attention to the scope of the Introduction might have convinced the Reviewer, that the sense in which the word *moral* is there used, whether rightly or otherwise, is quite general, and applies equally to our conduct in religious as in civil matters. Without attaching this meaning to the term moral doctrines, the whole of the concluding sentence must appear absurd, where it is said, "This simple code is well fitted to regulate the conduct of the human race in the discharge of their various duties to God, to themselves, and to society." This assertion is corroborated and supported by a great number of pas-

Digitized by Google

sages in the treatise in question, which point out the appropriate mode of performing our duty to the Almighty Power. It is, however, too true to be denied, that the Compiler of those moral precepts separated them from some of the dogmas and other matters, chiefly under the supposition, that they alone were a sufficient guide to secure peace and happiness to mankind at large—a position that is entirely founded on and supported by the express authorities of Jesus of Nazareth—a denial of which would imply a total disavowal of Christianity. Some of those authorities, as found amongst these precepts, here follow: *Matthew*, ch. xxii. beginning with ver. 37: "Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. 38. This is the first and great commandment. 39. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. 40. ON THESE TWO COMMANDMENTS HANG ALL THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS." *Mark*, ch. xii. beginning with ver. 29: "And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord. 30. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength. This is the first commandment. 31. And the second is LIKE, namely this: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself: there is no other commandment greater than these. 32. And he said unto him, Well, Master, thou hast said the truth;

Digitized by Google

for there is one God, and there is none other but he. 33. And to love him with all the heart, with all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love his neighbour as himself, is more than all burnt-offerings and sacrifices. 34. And when Jesus saw that he answered discreetly, he said unto him, Thou art not far from the kingdom of God." *Matthew*, ch. vii. ver. 12: "Therefore all things whatever you would that men should do to you, do you even so to men; FOR THIS IS THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS. Ch. v. Think not that I am come to destroy the Law or Prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." *Luke*, ch. x. beginning with ver. 25: "And behold, a certain lawyer stood up and tempted him, saying, Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? 26. He said unto him, What is written in the Law? How readest thou? 27. He answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbour as thyself. 28. And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right. THIS DO AND THOU SHALT LIVE." The Saviour meant of course by the words *Law* and *Prophets*, all the commandments ordained by divine authority, and the religion revealed to the prophets and observed by them; as is evident from Jesus's declaring those commandments to afford perfect means of acquiring eternal life, and directing men to follow them accordingly. Had any other doctrine been requisite to teach men

the road to peace and happiness, Jesus could not have pronounced to the lawyer, "This do and THOU SHALT LIVE." It was the characteristic of the office of Christ to teach men, that forms and ceremonies were useless tokens of respect for God, compared with the essential proof of obedience and love towards him evinced by the practice of beneficence towards their fellow-creatures. The Compiler, finding these commandments given as including all the revealed law, and the whole system of religion adopted by the prophets, and re-established and fulfilled by Jesus himself, as the means to acquire peace and happiness, was desirous of giving more full publicity in this country to them, and to the subsidiary moral doctrines that are introduced by the Saviour in detail. Placing also implicit confidence in the truth of his sacred commandments, to the observance of which we are directed by the same Teacher, (*John*, ch. xiv. ver. 16. "If ye love me, keep my commandments;" ver. 24, "He that loveth me not, keepeth not my sayings,") the Compiler never hesitated in declaring (page 1.) "a belief in God, and a due regard to that law, 'Do unto others as you would wish to be done by,' render our existence agreeable to ourselves, and profitable to the rest of mankind." It may now be left to the public to judge, whether or not the charge of arrogance and presumption which the Reviewer has imputed to the Compiler, under the idea that he preferred his own judgment to that of the Saviour, be justly applicable to him.

Digitized by Google

3. The respected Reviewer argues in *page* 26, that there are two important points, a knowledge of which is not to be acquired by following the moral precepts of Christ, but which are essential to the attainment of true peace of mind; they being entirely founded (as he alleges) upon the dogmas and histories, viz. how to obtain, 1st, the forgiveness of sins, and the favour of God; and 2dly, strength to overcome human passions, and to keep the commandments of God. These precepts, separated from the mysterious dogmas and historical records, appear, on the contrary, to the Compiler, to contain not only the essence of all that is necessary to instruct mankind in their civil duties, but also the best and only means of obtaining the forgiveness of our sins, the favour of God, and strength to overcome our passions, and to keep his commandments. I therefore extract from the same compilation a few passages of that greatest of all prophets, who was sent to call sinners to repentance; a due attention to which will, I hope, satisfy the respected Reviewer on those two points. *Luke*, ch. xiii. ver. 3: "Except you repent, you shall all likewise perish." Ch. xv. ver. 7: "I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine persons who need no repentance. I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth." *Matthew*, ch. ix. "I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repent-

Digitized by Google

ance." Ch. xviii. "For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost" *Luke*, ch. vi. "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." Which sayings are confirmatory of what is taught in *Ezekiel*, ch. xviii. ver. 30: "Repent and turn yourselves from all your transgressions, so iniquity shall not be your ruin." See also the parable of the prodigal son, where the mercy of God is illustrated by the example of a father pardoning the transgressions of his repenting son. Numerous passages of the Old and the New Testaments to the same effect, which might fill a volume, distinctly promise us that the forgiveness of God and the favour of his Divine Majesty may be obtained by sincere repentance, as required of sinners by the Redeemer.

As to the second point, that is, How to be enabled to overcome our passions, and keep the commandments of God:—we are not left unprovided for in that respect, as our gracious Saviour has promised every strength and power as necessary consequences of earnest prayer and hearty desire. *Matthew*, ch. vii. and *Luke*, ch. vi. "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you." "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him!" *Luke*, ch. xi. "I say unto you, Ask, and it shall be given you." After a due attention to these, and to numerous passages of the same

Digitized by Google

effect, no one who believes in the divine message of Jesus of Nazareth, or even in the truth of his doctrine only, can be at all at a loss to find adequate means of attaining those two ends, justly considered to be most essential by the Reviewer.

4. The Reviewer imputes to the Compiler, error in exalting the value of the moral doctrines above that of the historical facts and dogmas contained in the New Testament. This imputation, I humbly maintain, can be of no weight or force against the authority of Jesus himself, as quoted in the above texts; which clearly show, that there is no other means of attaining eternal life except the performance of our duties towards God in obeying his commandments. That the aim and object of all the commandments of God is to teach us our duty towards our fellow creatures, may be gathered from a hundred passages of Scripture, of which, perhaps, the following may suffice. *Matthew*, ch. xxv. ver. 31: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory. And before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats. And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. For I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat: I

Digitized by Google

was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me. Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink? When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee? Or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee? And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me. Then shall he say unto them also on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. For I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not: sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not. Then shall they also answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee? Then shall he answer them, saying, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." In this description of the day of judgment it is clearly announced, that the merciful Father of the

Digitized by Google

universe accepts as [a] manifestation of love towards himself, every act of charity and beneficence performed towards his creatures. (See text already quoted, *Matthew*, ch. vii. ver. 12.) And apparently to counteract by anticipation the erroneous idea that such conduct might be dispensed with, and reliance placed on a mere dogmatical knowledge of God, or of the Saviour, the following declaration seems to have been uttered. *Matthew*, ch. vii. ver. 21 : " Not every one that saith unto me, Lord ! Lord ! shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven. Many will say unto me in that day, Lord ! Lord ! have we not prophesied in thy name ; and in thy name have cast out devils ; and in thy name done many wonderful works ? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you ; depart from me, ye that work iniquity. Therefore whosoever heareth *these sayings* of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, who built his house upon a rock. And every one that heareth *these sayings* of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, who built his house upon the sand." *Matthew*, ch. xii. " Whosoever shall do the will of my Father who is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother." *Luke*, ch. ix. " My mother and my brethren are those which hear the word of God and do it." Ch. xi. " Blessed is the womb (said a certain woman to Jesus) that bare thee, and the paps which thou

Digitized by Google

hast sucked: but he said, Yea, rather blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it." *John*, ch. xv. "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love: even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love." What, then, are THOSE SAYINGS, the obedience to which is so absolutely commanded as indispensable and all-sufficient to those who desire to inherit eternal life? They are no other than the blessed and benign moral doctrines taught in the sermon on the mount, (contained in the 5th, 6th, and 7th chapters of Matthew,) which include therefore every duty of man, and all that is necessary to salvation; and they expressly exclude mere profession or belief, from those circumstances which God graciously admits as giving a title to eternal happiness. Neither in this, nor in any other part of the New Testament, can we find a commandment similarly enjoining a knowledge of any of the mysteries or historical relations contained in those books. It is besides plainly stated, that but a very small portion of the works of Jesus have been handed down to us by the Evangelists. John says, at the conclusion of his gospel, ch. xxi. ver. 25. "There are also many other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one, I suppose the world itself could not contain the books that should be written." On the other hand, we cannot doubt that the whole spirit of his doctrines has been faithfully and fully recorded. The reason of this appears obvious:

Digitized by Google

—miracles must have had a powerful effect on the minds of those who witnessed them, and who, without some such evidence, were disposed to question the authority of the teacher of those doctrines. *John*, ch. xv. ver. 23: "The works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of me." Ver. 37 and 38: "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works." Had his doctrines of themselves made their due impressions, the aid of miracles would not have been requisite, nor had recourse to. In this country, the bare report of such miracles could have given no support to the weight of the doctrines; for, as the Compiler has stated in his Introduction, miracles infinitely more wonderful are related of their gods and saints, on authorities that the Hindoos must deem superior to those of the Apostles.

We are taught by revelation, as well as education, to ascribe to the Deity, the perfection of those attributes which are esteemed excellent amongst mankind. And according to those ideas it must surely appear more consistent with the justice of the Sovereign Ruler, that he should admit to mercy those of his subjects who, acknowledging his authority, have endeavoured to obey his laws; or shown contrition, when they have fallen short of their duty and love; than that he should select for favour those whose claims rest on having acquired particular ideas of his nature,

Digitized by Google

and of the origin of his Son, and of what afflictions that Son may have suffered in behalf of his people. If the Reviewer and Editor will continue to resist both authority and common sense, I must be content to take leave of them with the following words, (*Luke*, ch. xviii.) "And he said unto him, If they hear Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead."

5. The Reviewer observes, (in page 24.) with every mark of disapprobation, that the Compiler has intimated in the Introduction, that the dogmatical and historical matters are rather calculated to do injury. The Compiler could not certainly overlook the daily occurrences and obvious facts which led him to remark, [in the Introduction,] that "historical and some other passages are liable to the doubts and disputes of Freethinkers and Anti-christians, especially miraculous relations, which are much less wonderful than the fabricated tales handed down to the natives of Asia :" and to prove what the Compiler stated, I humbly entreat any one to refer to the numerous volumes written by persons unattached to any of the established churches against the miracles, the history, and some of the dogmas of Christianity. It has been the different interpretations of the dogmas that have given rise to such keen disputes amongst the followers of Jesus. They have not only destroyed harmony and union between one sect of Christians and another, and continue to do so ;

Digitized by Google

but in past times have even caused continual wars and frequent bloodshed to rage amongst them, more dreadfully than between Christians and infidels. A slight reference to the histories of Christian countries will, I trust, afford to my readers entire conviction upon this head. Besides, the Compiler, residing in the same spot where European missionary gentlemen and others for a period of upwards of twenty years have been, with a view to promote Christianity, distributing in vain amongst the natives numberless copies of the complete Bible, written in different languages, could not be altogether ignorant of the causes of their disappointment. He, however, never doubted their zeal for the promulgation of Christianity, nor the accuracy of their statement with regard to immense sums of money being annually expended in preparing vast numbers of copies of the Scriptures; but he has seen with regret, that they have completely counteracted their own benevolent efforts, by introducing all the dogmas and mysteries taught in Christian Churches to people by no means prepared to receive them; and that they have been so incautious and inconsiderate in their attempts to enlighten the natives of India, as to address their instructions to them in the same way as if they were reasoning with persons brought up in a Christian country, with those dogmatical notions imbibed from their infancy. The consequence has been, that the natives in general, instead of benefiting by the

Digitized by Google

perusal of the Bible, copies of which they always receive gratuitously, exchange them very often for blank paper; and generally use several of the dogmatical terms in their native language as a mark of slight in an irreverent manner; the mention of which is repugnant to my feelings. Sabat, an eminently learned but grossly unprincipled Arab, whom our divines supposed that they had converted to Christianity, and whom they of course instructed in all the dogmas and doctrines, wrote a few years ago a treatise in Arabic against those very dogmas, and printed himself and published several hundred copies of this work. And another Moosulman, of the name of Ena'et Ahmud, a man of respectable family, who is still alive, and speedily returned to Mohummudanism from Christianity, pleading that he had not been able to reconcile to his understanding certain dogmas which were imparted to him. It has been owing to their beginning with the introduction of mysterious dogmas, and of relations that at first sight appear incredible, that, notwithstanding every exertion on the part of our divines, I am not aware that we can find a single respectable Moosulman or Hindoo, who were not in want of the common comforts of life, once glorified with the truth of Christianity, constantly adhering to it. Of the few hundred natives who have been nominally converted to Christianity, and who have been generally of the most ignorant class, there is ground to suspect that the

Digitized by Google

greater number have been allured to change their faith by other attractions than by a conviction of the truth and reasonableness of those dogmas; as we find nearly all of them are employed or fed by their spiritual teachers, and in case of neglect are apt to manifest a rebellious spirit;—a circumstance which is well known to the Compiler from several local facts, as well as from the following occurrence. About three years ago, the Compiler, on his visit to an English gentleman, who is still residing in the vicinity of Calcutta, saw a great number of Christian converts with a petition, which they intended to present to the highest ecclesiastical authority, stating, that their teachers, through false promises of advancement, had induced them to give up their ancient religion. The Compiler felt indignant at their presumption, and suggested to the gentlemen, as a friend, the propriety of not countenancing a set of men who, from their own declaration, seemed so unprincipled. The Missionaries themselves are as well aware as the Compiler, that those very dogmas are the points which the people always select as the most proper for attack, both in their oral and written controversies with Christian teachers; all of which, if required, the Compiler is prepared to prove by the most unquestionable testimony.

Under these circumstances, the Compiler published such sayings of Christ, as he thought intelligible to all, conveying conviction with them, and best calculated to lead mankind to universal love

Digitized by Google

and harmony ; not dwelling upon those matters, an observance of which is not absolutely ordained, and the interpretations of which, instead of introducing peace and happiness, have generally given rise to disputes and controversies. The Compiler had no local influence nor power to promote any one's interest, nor has he situations to give away, nor yet has he friends and colleagues to recommend others to their patronage. Humble as he is, he has therefore adopted those measures which he thought most judicious, to spread the truth in an acceptable manner ; but I am sorry to observe, that he has unfortunately and unexpectedly met with opposition from those whom he considered the last persons likely to oppose him on this subject. From what has already been advanced, the Reviewer may perceive the reason why the passages extracted by the Compiler from the Gospel of St. John should be comparatively few. It is from this source that the most difficult to be comprehended of the dogmas of the Christian religion have been principally drawn : and on the foundation of passages of that writer, the interpretation of which is still a matter of keen discussion amongst the most learned and most pious scholars in Christendom, is erected the mysterious doctrine of three Gods in one Godhead, the origin of Mohummudanism, and the stumbling-block to the conversion of the more enlightened amongst the Hindoos.

To impress more strongly on the minds of those for whom this compilation was intended, the

Digitized by Google

doctrines taught by Jesus, the Compiler thought the varied repetition of them by different but concurring reporters highly advantageous, as showing, clearly, that those doctrines were neither misrepresented nor misconceived by any of those Evangelists.

6. Nor is the conduct of the Compiler in selecting certain passages of the Scriptures for certain purposes singular; for we see very often extracts from the Bible, published by the learned men of every sect of Christians, with a view to the maintenance of particular doctrines. Christian Churches have selected passages from the Bible, which they conceive particularly excellent, and well adapted for the constant perusal and study of the people of their respective churches; and besides, it is the continual practice of every Christian teacher to choose from the whole Scriptures such texts as he deems most important, for the purposes of illustrating them, and impressing them on the minds of his hearers. Nor will those teachers, if questioned as to their object in such selection, hesitate to assign as their motive the very reason adopted by the Compiler as his—the superior importance of the parts so selected. Whether or not he has erred in his judgment on that point, must be determined by those who will candidly peruse and consider the arguments already advanced on the subject, always bearing in mind the lesson practically taught by the Saviour himself, of adapting his instructions to the susceptibility and capacity of his hearers. *John* xvi. 12:

Digitized by Google

"I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now."

Hindostan is a country, of which nearly 3-5ths of the inhabitants are Hindoos, and 2-5ths Moosulmans. Although the professors of neither of these religions are possessed of such accomplishments as are enjoyed by Europeans in general, yet the latter portion are well known to be firmly devoted to a belief in one God, which has been instilled into their minds from their infancy. The former (I mean the Hindoos) are, with a few exceptions, immersed in gross idolatry, and in belief of the most extravagant descriptions respecting futurity, antiquity, and the miracles of their deities and saints, as handed down to them and recorded in their ancient books. Weighing these circumstances, and anxious, from his long experience of religious controversy with natives, to avoid further disputation with them, the Compiler selected those precepts of Jesus, the obedience to which he believed most peculiarly required of a Christian, and such as could by no means tend, in doctrine, to excite the religious horror of Mohummedans, or the scoffs of Hindoos. What benefit or peace of mind can we bestow upon a Moosulman, who is an entire stranger to the Christian world, by communicating to him without preparatory instruction all the peculiar dogmas of Christianity: such as those contained in *ver.* 1st, *chap.* 1st, of *St. John,* "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God?" Would they not find them-

Digitized by Google

selves at a loss to reconcile this dogma to their unprepared understandings, viz. A. is B., and A. is also with B.? Although the interpretations given us of such texts by truly learned and candid divines be ever so satisfactory, yet, to those that are strangers to these explanations, they cannot be intelligible; nor can it be expected from the order of things, that each can happily find at hand an able interpreter, to whom he can have recourse for an explanation, whenever he may be involved in difficulties or doubts. But as a great number of Missionary gentlemen may perhaps view the matter in a different light, and join the Editor of the Friend of India, in accusing the Compiler as an injurer of the cause of truth, I doubt not that with a view to avoid every possibility of such imputation, and to prevent others from attributing their ill success to his interference with their duties, he would gladly abstain from publishing again on the same subject, if he could see in past experience any thing to justify hopes of their success. From what I have already stated, I hope no one will infer that I feel ill-disposed towards the Missionary establishments in this country. This is far from being the case. I pray for their augmentation, and that their members may remain in the happy enjoyment of life in a climate so generally inimical to European constitutions; for in proportion to the increase of their numbers, sobriety, moderation, temperance, and good behaviour, have been diffused among their neighbours as the necessary consequences of their company, conversation, and good example.

Digitized by Google

[7.] The Reviewer charges the Compiler with inconsistency, (p. 27.) because he has termed the precepts collected by him, a code of religion and morality, while, as the Reviewer supposes, they form only a code of morality and not of religion. It is already explained in paragraph 2d, that the Compiler has introduced those precepts of Jesus under the denomination of the moral sayings of the New Testament, taking the word moral in its wide sense, as including our conduct to God, to each other, and to ourselves; and to avoid the least possibility of misunderstanding the term, he has carefully particularized the sense in which he accepted that word by the latter sentence, "This simple code of Religion and Morality, (meaning by the former, those precepts which treat of our duty to God, and by the latter, such as relate to our duties to mankind and to ourselves,) is so admirably calculated to elevate men's ideas to high and liberal notions of one God," &c. "and is also so well fitted to regulate the conduct of the human race in the discharge of their various duties to God, to themselves, and to society," &c. In conformity to the design thus expressed, he has collected all the sayings that have a tendency to those ends. The Compiler, however, observes with regret, that neither this language nor this fact, has afforded to the Reviewer satisfactory evidence of his intention, nor sufficed to save him from the unexpected imputation of inconsistency.

The Reviewer again (page 29.) charges the Compiler with inconsistency, in having introdu

ced some doctrinal passages into his compilation. In reply to which, I again entreat the attention of the respected Reviewer to that passage in the Introduction, in which the Compiler states the motives that have led him to exclude certain parts of the gospels from his publication. He there states, that it is on account of these passages being such as were the ordinary foundation of the arguments of the opponents of Christianity, or the sources of the interminable controversies that have led to heart-burnings and even bloodshed amongst Christians, that they were not included in his selection; and they were omitted the more readily, as he considered them not essential to religion. But such dogmas, or doctrinal and other passages, as are not exposed to these objections, and are not unfamiliar to the minds of those for whose benefit the compilation was intended, are generally included, in conformity with the avowed plan of the work—particularly such as seem calculated to direct our love and obedience to the beneficent Author of the universe, and to him whom he graciously sent to deliver those Precepts of Religion and Morality, whose tendency is to promote universal peace and harmony.

8. In objecting to the assertion made by the Compiler in the Introduction as to a belief in the existence of God prevailing generally, the respected Reviewer advances three arguments:—1st, That millions of people believe in a plurality of Gods. 2dly, That the majority of those enlightened persons who deny the truth of the Jewish

Digitized by Google

and Christian Revelation are Atheists. 3dly, That the very system of the Vedant, which denies to God his moral attributes, is a refined and disguised Atheism. I certainly admit that a great number of men, and even men of profound learning and extensive abilities, are, owing to their early education, literally sunk in Polytheism, an absurd and irrational system of religion. But the admission of a plurality of Gods does not amount to the denial of Godhead. A man, for instance, cannot be accused of having no notion of mankind, because he is proved to believe in the existence of a plurality of individuals. The Reviewer ought therefore, to have confined himself to the remark, the truth of which will be readily admitted, that there are millions of people ignorant of the Unity of God; the only doctrine consistent with reason and revelation. The astonishing eagerness of the learned amongst those whose practice and language are polytheistical, to prefer their claim to be considered as Monotheists, is a strong evidence of the consistency of the system of Monotheism with reason. Debased and despicable as is the belief of the Hindoos in three hundred and thirty millions of gods, they pretend to reconcile this persuasion with the doctrine of the Unity of God; alleging that the three hundred and thirty millions of gods, whom they enumerate, are subordinate agents, assuming various offices in preserving the harmony of the universe under one Godhead, as innumerable rays issue from one sun. I am at a loss to trace the origin of this second argument, impu-

Digitized by Google

ting Atheism to the majority of those who deny the divinity of the Jewish and Christian Revelation. For, notwithstanding my acquaintance with several Europeans and Asiatics who doubt the possibility of Revelation, I have never met with one, to the best of my recollection, maintaining Atheism, however widely they might differ from the Reviewer and the Compiler in a great many points of belief relating to the Deity. The Reviewer, perhaps, may have met with some unhappy Freethinkers, who have professed doubts respecting the existence of a supreme superintending power—a circumstance which has probably induced him to form this opinion; but such rare instances can have no force to set aside the credit of what the Compiler affirms, that a belief in God *prevails generally*. Neither can I conscientiously coincide with the respected Reviewer in his imputing Atheism to the Vedant system, under the supposition of its denying moral attributes to God; nor can I help lamenting that religious prejudice should influence the Reviewer so much, as to make him apply the term of Atheist towards a sect or to individuals who look up to the God of nature through his wonderful works alone; for the Vedant, in common with the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, from the impossibility of forming more exalted conceptions, constantly ascribes to God the perfection of those moral attributes which are considered among the human species excellent and sublime. To prove this, I quote one passage from each of the four

Digitized by Google

Oopunishuds of the Vedant, which have already been translated into English. Moonduk, ch. 1. sect 1: "By him who knows all things collectively and distinctly, whose knowledge and will are the only means of his actions, Bruhma, name, and form, and all that vegetates, are produced." Kuthu, ch. 5: "God is eternal, among all the perishable universe: and is the source of sensation among all animate existences; and he alone assigns to so many objects their respective purposes," Kenopunishud: "In a battle between the celestial gods, and the demons, God enabled the former to defeat the latter." And Ishopunishud: "He overspreads all creatures, is merely spirit without the form either of a minute body or of an extended one, which is liable to impression or organization. He is pure, perfect, omniscient, the Ruler of the intellect, omnipresent, and the self-existent. He has from eternity been assigning to all creatures their respective purposes." For further evidence, if required, I beg to refer the Reviewer to the rest of the original Vedant works that may be found in the College Library and in the Missionary stores of books. It is, however, very true, that the Vedant declares very often its total ignorance of the real nature and attributes of God. Kenopunishud, ver. 3: "Hence no vision can approach him, no language can describe him, no intellectual power can compass or determine him; we know nothing how the Supreme Being should be explained," &c. It also repre-

Digitized by Google

sents God sometimes in a manner familiar to the understanding of the vulgar. Moonduk, ch. 7, sect. 1 : " Heaven is the head, and the sun and the moon are his eyes ; space is his ears," &c. But such declarations are not peculiar to the Vedant doctrines, as these are found frequently in the sacred Scriptures. *Job* xxxvi. 26 : " Behold God is great, and we know him not ;" " touching the Almighty we cannot find him out ; his greatness is unsearchable." The Scriptures also represent God in the same familiar and figurative manner as is found in the Vedant. God is affirmed to have made man in his own image, after his own likeness. The angels always behold God's face in heaven. In the Old Testament, as well as in the New, God is represented as repenting of his works, as being moved with anger, vexation, grief, joy, love, and hate : as moving from place to place ; having arms, with hands and fingers ; a head, with face, mouth, tongue, eyes, nose, ears, a heart, bowels, back, thighs, legs ; as seeing, being seen, speaking and hearing, slumbering, waking, &c. No one capable of sound reasoning can for a moment imagine that these or any other descriptions of God are intended to convey literal notions of the unsearchable incomprehensible Being.

May God render religion destructive of differences and dislike between man and man, and conducive to the peace and union of mankind.—Amen.

Digitized by Google

SECOND APPEAL

TO

THE CHRISTIAN PUBLIC,

IN DEFENCE OF THE

"*PRECEPTS OF JESUS.*"

BY

RAMMOHUN ROY.

FROM THE LONDON EDITION.

NEW-YORK:
PUBLISHED BY B. BATES, 380 BROADWAY.

1825.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

ADVERTISEMENT.

The contents of the following Treatise are included under these two propositions :—1st, That the Precepts of Jesus, which teach that love to God is manifested in beneficence towards our fellow-creatures, are a sufficient Guide to Peace and Happiness; and 2ndly, That that omnipresent God, who is the only proper object of religious veneration, is one and undivided in person.

Though these doctrines, as I conceive them to be alike founded on reason and revelation, appear to me to be almost as obvious thruths as any abstract axium, yet they are opposed in fact by a very large body of writers and teachers. I must therefore leave them to be decided upon by those, who will be pleased to bestow their candid and liberal attention on the arguments I have used in the succeeding pages ;—and on their impartial judgment I confidently rely.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

	Page.
Alteration of Style in the review, - - - - -	145
Two points which the Editor wishes to establish, to wit, the excellency of the Dogmas and the insufficiency of the Precepts, - - - - - - - -	145, 146
The Compiler acknowledges the first, - - - - -	146
Rejects the second, - - - - - - - -	147
Passages showing the sufficiency of the Precepts—God one, and the object of supreme love, - - - - -	148
The authority of Paul quoted, inapplicable, - - - -	150
Justifying a selection as the substitute for the whole, -	ib.
The Precepts of Jesus practicable, - - - - -	151
The contradiction between the indispensableness of the Doctrines and the sufficiency of the Precepts, - - - -	153
Repentance the only means of forgiveness, - - - .	154

CHAPTER II.

Positions of the Reviewer, - - - - - - - -	155
Jesus receives all power from God, - - - - -	156
Power given to Jesus as the Son of God, - - - -	157
The unity between God and Jesus, and between him and his disciples, - - - - - - - - - -	162
God dwelleth in Jesus and he in God, - - - - -	163
Jesus considered distinct from God, - - - - -	165
He that hath seen the Son hath seen the Father, - -	ib.
Definition of the unity between God and Jesus, - -	167
Jesus's disavowal of his own Deity, - - - -	ib.
The Jews charged Jesus only with calling himself the Son of God, - - - - - - -	168

Page.

The term "God" frequently applied to existences inferior to God, - - - - - - - 168
The term "for ever" often applied to created beings, 170
John i. 1, explained, , - - - - - 171
Hindoos believe in one Godhead, consisting of numerous persons under it, - - - - - - 172
Jesus performs wonderful works, which do not amount to equality with those of God, - - - 173

CHAPTER III.

The first position of the Editor, on the ubiquity of Jesus, 175
John iii. 13, explained, - - - - - *ib.*
—— viii. 58, xi. 8, - - . - - *ib.*
—— xi. 38 ; Matt. xxvi. 2 ; John xiii. 6, xvi. 32 ; Matt. ii. 13, 15 ; John vi. 62, - - - - 176
—— xvi. 7. 5, 28, xiii. 36, - - - 177
Matt. xviii. 20, explained, - - - - 179
Luke xvi. 29, - - - - - *ib.*
The second position of the Editor, on the incomprehensibility of the nature of Jesus, - - - 180
Matt. xi. 27, explained, - - - - *ib.*
John xiv. 16, 17, - - - - - 181
Mark xiii. 32, explained, - - - - *ib.*
Matt. xi. 28, [Prov. xxix. 17,] explained, - - 182
The third position of the Editor, on Jesus forgiving sins in an independent manner, - - - - *ib.*
Mark ii. 5, 9, explained, . - - - *ib.*
Acts v. 31, 32, xiii. 38, - - - - 183
Luke xxiii. 34, xi. 4 ; Matt. vi 14, - - - 184
The fourth position of the Editor, respecting the almighty power of Jesus, - - - - - *ib.*
John v. 21—23, explained, - - - - *ib.*
——— 19—36 - - - - - 185
Deut. xviii. 15, 18 ; Acts iii. 22, vii. 37, considered, 187
Matt. xx. 23, xii. 28, xxvi. 39, considered, - - 188

Digitized by Google

Page

Matt. xxvi. 42; Luke xxii. 32; John xii. 27, separately explained, - - - - - - 188
Matt. x. 40; John v. 23, separately explained, - - 189
Matt. v. 48, - - - - - - - ib.
The fifth position of the Editor, respecting the judgment of the world by Jesus, - - - - - ib.
Matt. iii. 9; Luke i. 37, - - - - - 190
From this the Editor infers his omniscience - - ib.
Mark xiii. 32, considered, - - . - ib.
John v. 26, 27, 30, considered, - - - - 191
The sixth position of the Editor, respecting the worship accepted by Jesus - - - - - ib.
Daniel ii. 46; Matt. xviii. 26, considered, - - 192
John iv. 24; Matt. iv. 10, xix. 17, - - - ib.
—— ix. 31, 33, 38; Mark v. 7, - - - 193
Luke xvii. 15, 16; Matt. xiv. 33, xv. 25; Mark viii. 29; Luke xxiv. 19, - - - - - 194
John vi. 69, xx. 31; Matt. viii. 2, - - - 195
The worship paid to Jesus inferior to divine - 191—195
Jesus himself worshipped the Father; Matt. vi. 9, xxvi. 53; John xvi. 26; Luke xxii. 41, 42; Mark xiv. 35, 36; Luke vi. 12, x. 21; John xi. 41; Matt. xxvii. 46; John iv. 22, - - - - - - - 196
The seventh position of the Editor, respecting the form of Baptism, Matt. xxviii. 19; Exod. xiv. 31, - - 197
Mohummud joins his own name with that of God in his form of belief, - - - - - - 198
Matt. xxviii. 18, considered, - - - - ib.
Synonymous expressions employed by Mohummud and Jesus, - - - - - - 199
Musulmans, notwithstanding, remain strict Monotheists, - 200

CHAPTER IV.

Texts adduced in support of the atonement, explained, - 201
Luke iv. 43, ii. 47—49; John xvii. 8; - - - 202
The sufferings of Jesus, and of other Prophets, unaccountable, except as prophesied, - - - - 203

Digitized by Google

Page
John ix. 3; Mark xii. 1—9, considered, - - - 204
—— xv. 21, 22, - - - - - - 205
Whether Jesus suffered as God or as Man, for mankind, - *ib.*
The first inconsistent with the nature of God, - - *ib.*
The last inconsistent with justice, - - - 206
Jesus averse to the death of the cross, - - - *ib.*
Matthew xxvi. 37, 39, 42, 43; Mark xiv. 36, considered, - *ib.*
Luke xxii. 42, 44; John xii. 27; xi. 17, 18; Matt. xxvi. 53, 54, considered, - - - - - - 207
The application of the term Saviour to Jesus a supposed proof of the atonement, - - - - 208
Obadiah 21; Nehemiah ix. 27; 2 Kings xiii. 5, considered, *ib.*
Jesus is a Saviour from inculcating the word of God, - 209
John xv. 3, v. 24. vi. 63, considered, - *ib.*
God declares Christ a Prophet equal to Moses, - - *ib.*
Matthew v. 7. - - - - - - *ib.*
——— xxiii. 2, 3, - - - - - - 210
Jesus was a perfect teacher of the divine will, - - *ib.*
Matthew v. 21, 22, - - - - - *ib.*
——— v. 27, 28, 31, 32, 38, 39, 43—45, considered, - 211
The term "Lamb of God" explained, - - - 212
Nature of Christ, - - - - - - 213
God shows mercy for righteousness' sake, - - *ib.*
Genesis xxx. 27; Jeremiah xxvii. 18; Genesis xlviii. 16; Exodus xxiii. 20, 21, - - - - 214
The Author offers no opinion on this doctrine - - *ib.*

CHAPTER V.

Disputes ascribed to the different interpretations of the Dogmas, - - - - - - - 215
Illiberality in supposing that the primitive Christians shed each other's blood from worldly motives, - - 216
Mosheim's Authority, Vol. I. pp. 419, 420, - - *ib.*
Illiberal remarks may be equally applied to the Apostles and Martyrs, - - - - - - 217
The cause of the final success of Alexandrians (afterwards called the Orthodox) over Arians, - - - *ib.*

Digitized by Google

Page

Violent contentions between Roman Catholics and Protestants, 218
Matthew x. 34, explained by its contents, - - 219
Difference between the peculiar Doctrines of the Gospel and the tenet of the existence of God, - - 221
The miracles quoted by the Reviewer to show their importance, considered, - - - - - - 222
Matthew xi. 2—4, - - - - - - *ib.*
John x. 37, 38, xiv. 11; Matthew xii. 39; John xx. 29, considered, - - - - - - - 223
The arguments adduced by the Reviewer in support of Christian miracles are equally applicable to Hindoo miracles, 224
And also to the miraculous narrations of Mussulmans, 225
Superior excellence of the Precepts of Jesus, - 226

CHAPTER VI.

Only one circumstance adduced in support of the Deity of the Spirit as a distinct person - - - 227
The association of the name of the Spirit with that of the Father and Son inadequate to prove this doctrine, - 228
Prophets associated with God. 2 Chron. xx. 20; Jeremiah xxx. 9; Luke iii. 16, - - - - - *ib.*
The Holy Spirit explained to be the guiding influence of God, John xiv. 6, xvi. 13, - - - 229
Anger, mercy, truth, &c. personified as well as the Holy Spirit. 2 Kings xxiv. 20; Psalm xc. 7, xxi. 7, vi. 4; Luke xii. 12; Acts i. 8; John xiv. 26; Psalm lvii. 3. lxxxv. 10, c. 5, xxxiii. 22, xxxvi. 5, cviii. 4; [Ezek.] vii. 3; 2 Chron. xxiv. 18, - - - - - 230
The bad consequences of supposing the Spirit to be a person of God, Matt. i. 11, 20; Luke i. 35, - - 231
This opinion also inconsistent with the use of the term in Matt. iii. 11; Luke iii. 16; Acts x. 38; Matt. xii. 28, 31; Luke iv. 1, iii. 22, - - - - - 232
The Jews accuse Jesus of employing diabolical influence, 234
Matt. xii. 24, 37, with context; and Mark iii. 29, 30, explained, - - - - - - - *ib.*

Digitized by Google

Page

The Spirit of God was bestowed before the coming of Jesus, Luke i. 15, 41, 67, ii. 25, 26; Mark xii. 36; Matt. xxii. 43; Luke iv. 1, - - - - - - 237, 238

Acts v. 3, 4; John xv. 26, explained, - - 239

The plural number of nouns and pronouns in Hebrew, &c. is often used for a singular agent or object. Gen. i. 26; Deut. iv. 4; Exod. xxi. 4, 6; Isaiah vi. 8, 240—242

The same rule observed in Arabic; of which an example from the Qoran, - - - - 242

The thrice repeated term "holy" in Isaiah vi. 3, noticed, 243

The verse which has been introduced as John v. 7, noticed, *ib.*

The Trinity not taught by the Apostles, - - 244

This proved by Acts ii. 22, 32, 36, iii. 22, 23, iv. 12, 26. 27, v. 31, 7, [vii. 56,] viii. 37, 37, x. 38, 42, xiii. 38, xvii. 3, - - - - - - 245, 246

Extracts from Mosheim, Vol. I. pp. 100, 411, 412, 414, showing that so late as the year 314, the Deity of the Son was not considered a fundamental article of faith, 247, 249

Reason why Trinitarians prevailed at the council of Nice, 250

Another extract from Mosheim, p. 25. Acts xxviii. 6, and xiv. 11, quoted, - - - - - 250, 251

Other extracts from Mosheim, showing that Polytheism was familiar to the Christian converts of the first ages, (pp. 65, 66,) - - - - - - 251

The prevalence of the Trinity attributable only to the prejudices of education, - - - - - 252

The alleged twofold consciousness of Jesus Christ considered, - - - - - - *ib.*

Moses might also be said to have a twofold consciousness, 253

Mode of reconciling apparent contradictions in Scripture, 254

Difficulties arising from neglecting this mode, - *ib.*

The argument drawn from the analogy of the soul, will and perception to the Trinity, considered, - - 255

The argument drawn from the analogy of the sun, light, and heat, to the Trinity, considered, - - 256

On the argument which represents Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as qualities of one Deity, - - - 257

Digitized by Google

Page

The union between Father and Son compared to that between the human soul and body, - - - - 257
Argument drawn from the alleged resemblance between the term "Son of Man" and "Son of God," - - 258
On the argument which represents God as a compound substance, - - - - - - ib.
John xvii. 3 : 1 Cor. xv. 24, viii 6; Ephes. iv. 5, 6. quoted, 259
Alleged necessity of the Deity of Jesus to his mediatorial character, - - - - - - ib.
This opposed to common sense, - - - 260
Opposed also to Scripture; Numbers xi. 1, 2, xvi. 19, 20, xxi. 7, xxxii. 30; Gen, xviii. 32; Jeremiah xxvii. 18; Deuteronomy v. 5, - - - - 260, 261
The arguments of Hindoos for Polytheism more powerful than those of Christians for the Trinity, - - 262

APPENDIX.

No. 1.

On the Quotations from the Old Testament contained in the New.

Matt. ii. 15. - - - - - - 263
—— iv. 4, - - - - - - - 264
—— 7, - - - - - - - ib.
—— ix. 13, - - - - - 265
—— xix. 19, xxii. 39, - - - - ib.
—— xxi. 42, - - - - - - ib.
—— xxii. 44, - - - - - - ib.
John x. 35, - - - - - 266
Matt. iv. 10, - - - - - 266
—— xiii. 14, - - - - - ib.
—— xix. 5, - - - - - 267
—— 18, 19, - - - - - ib.
—— xxii. 32, - - - - - ib.
—— 37, - - - - - ib.
——xxvi. 31, - - - - - - ib.

Digitized by Google

	Page
John vi. 45, - - - - - -	268
—— xiii. 18, - - - - - -	ib.
—— xv. 25, - - - - - -	269
Matt xxi. 16, - - - - - -	ib.
——— 13, - - - - - -	ib.
—— xv. 7—9, - - - - - -	ib.
—— xi. 10, - - - - - -	270
Luke iv. 8, - - - - - - -	ib.
——— 18, 19, - - - - - -	ib.
These quotations prove the subordinate nature of Jesus to God, - - - - - -	271

No. II.

On the References made to the Old Testament in Support of the Deity of Jesus.

John i. 14, compared with Isaiah ix. 6, explained, -	272
Hebrews i. 8, 9, compared with Psalm xlv. 6, 7, considered,	284
Luke i. 16, 17, compared with Isaiah xl. 3, and Malachi iii. 1,	285
John xii. 41, compared with Isaiah vi. 5, - -	286
1 Cor. i. 30, compared with Jeremiah xxiii. 6, -	ib.
The original of Jeremiah xxiii. 6, xxxiii. 16; Gen. xxv. 26; 2 Sam. ii. 16; Gen. xvi. 14, compared, - -	287, 288
Rom. xiv. 10, 12, compared with Isaiah xlv. 23, -	288
2 Peter iii. 18, compared with Isaiah xliii. 3, on the term Saviour, - - - - - - -	289
John x. 16, compared with Psalm xxiii. 1, on the term Shepherd, - - - - - - -	290
1 Cor. x. 9, compared with Psalm lxxviii. 56, on tempting Christ, - - - - - -	291
John iii. 29, compared with Psalm [Isaiah] liv. 5, on the term husband, - - - - -	292
Revelation xxii. 13, compared with Isaiah xliv. 6, on the phrase "Alpha and Omega," - - -	293
Rev. xxii. 12, compared with Isaiah xl. 10, on the phrase "My reward is with me," - - -	296

Digitized by Google

Page

Ephes. iv. 8, compared with Psalm lxviii. 18, on the phrase "Thou hast ascended on high," - - - - - 296
John xix. 37, compared with Zechariah xii. 10, on the phrase "whom they pierced," - - - - - - 297
1 Peter ii. 6—8, compared with Isaiah, xxviii. 16, and viii. 13, 14, on the phrase "stone of stumbling," &c. - 299, 300
The Hebrew and other Asiatic languages, full of metaphor, John x. 34—36, - - - - - - - - 301
The Deity of Moses and of David cannot be proved from Deut. xxx. 15; 1 Chron. xxix. 20, - - - - 302
Personal interest does not influence the author; nor desire of fame, - - - - - - - - - - 303
Nor the hope of success, - - - - - - - 304
But reverence for the author of Christianity, and a wish to raise it above all polytheistical systems, - - - ib.
The author's views derived from the Scriptures, - - ib.
The Old Testament should be studied before the New, - 305
Locke's testimony respecting the fundamental articles of Christianity, - - - - - - - - - - ib.
Extract from Sir Isaac Newton, pointing out the different natures of God and Christ, - - - - - - 306
Argument in favour of the Trinity, from its analogy to the triangle, considered, - - - - - - - ib.
Several arguments occurring in the beginning of Serle's Horæ Solitariæ, considered, - - - - - - 308
Conclusion, - - - - - - - - - 312

Digitized by Google

POSTSCRIPT.

Page

Dr. Prideaux's assertion respecting the testimony of Jonathan's Targum on Isaiah ix. 6, 7, examined, - - 313

The term "Messiah" applied to various kings, - - 314

Quotations from several ancient Jewish commentators, - ib.

On the difference of meaning between "to be called" and "to be," - - - - - - - - 315

Passages illustrating the epithets employed in Isaiah ix. 6, - 316

The terms "Son" and "only-begotten" incompatible with the nature of the First Cause, - - - - - ib.

The assertion respecting two sets of terms and phrases being applied to Jesus, examined, - - - - - 317

No Hindoo can conscientiously prefer the doctrine of the Trinity to Hindooism, - - - - - - ib.

True Christianity is free from Polytheism, - - - 318

Digitized by Google

SECOND APPEAL.

CHAPTER I.

General Defence of the Precepts in Question.

THE observations contained in No. I. of the Quarterly Series of "The Friend of India," on the Introduction to "The Precepts of Jesus," as well as on their defence, termed "An Appeal to the Christian Public," are happily expressed in so mild and Christian-like a style, that they have not only afforded me ample consolation for the disappointment and vexation I felt from the personality conveyed in the preceding Magazines, (Nos. 20 and 23.) but have also encouraged me to pursue my researches after the fundamental principles of Christianity in a manner agreeable to my feelings, and with such respect as I should always wish to manifest for the situation and character of so worthy a person as the Editor of the Friend of India.

The Reverend Editor labours in his Review to establish two points—the truth and excellency of the miraculous relations and of the dogmas found in the scriptural writings—and 2ndly, the insuffi-

Digitized by Google

ciency of the compiled Precepts of Jesus alone to lead to salvation, unless accompanied with the important doctrines of the Godhead of Jesus and his atonement.

As the Compiler neither in his Introduction to the Precepts of Jesus, nor in his defence of those Precepts, has expressed the least doubt as to the truth of any part of the Gospels, the arguments adduced by the learned Editor to demonstrate the truth and excellence of the authority on which they rest, are, I am inclined to think, quite superfluous, and foreign to the matter in question.

The only reasons assigned by the Compiler, ([in the] Introduction,) for separating the Precepts from the abstruse doctrines and miraculous relations of the New Testament, are, that the former "are liable to the doubts and disputes of Freethinkers and Antichristians, and the latter are capable at best of carrying little weight with the natives of this part of the globe, the fabricated tales handed down to them being of a more wonderful nature."

These sentiments respecting the doctrines and miracles, founded as they are upon undeniable facts, do not, I presume, convey any disavowal or doubt of their truth. Besides, in applying the term "fabricated" to the tales received by the credulous Hindoos, the Compiler clearly evinced the contemptible light in which he viewed those legends; and in stating that the miracles of the Scriptures were subject to the doubts of "Freethinkers and Antichristians," it can never fairly be supposed

Digitized by Google

that he meant himself, or any other person labouring in the promulgation of Christianity, to be included in that class.

As to the second point urged by the Reverend Editor, namely, that the compiled Precepts were not sufficient to lead to salvation, I deeply regret that the Editor should appear to have overlooked the authority of the gracious author of this religion in the several passages cited by the Compiler in his Appeal, to prove beyond doubt the sufficiency of the Precepts in question to procure eternal life; as it is almost impossible that so numerous quotations, spreading over a great part of the Appeal, could have escaped his notice. The Reverend Editor, while endeavouring to prove, that the compiled Precepts would fall short of guiding to peace and happiness, only illustrates by sacred authority the truth and excellency of the miracles and the doctrines of Christianity. But such illustration can have no tendency to demonstrate the position he endeavours to maintain; I am therefore under the necessity of repeating a few passages already quoted, with some others, showing that the compiled Precepts are sufficient to conduct the human race to happiness; and I humbly entreat to know, if I be persuaded to believe in the divine origin of those passages, and in the entire veracity of their author, how I am to reconcile their authority with the position maintained by the learned Editor, as to the insufficiency of the Precepts of Jesus to guide to peace and

Digitized by Google

happiness. *Matthew*, ch. xxii. beginning with ver. 37 : " Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind ; this is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the Law and the Prophets." *Mark*, ch. xii. beginning with ver. 29 : " And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength : this is the first commandment. And the second is like, namely this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is no other commandment greater than these." *Matthew*, ch. vii. ver. 12 : " Therefore all things whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you even so to them ; for this is the Law and the Prophets." *Luke*, ch. x. from ver. 25 : " And behold, a certain lawyer stood up and tempted him, saying, Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life ? He said unto him, What is written in the Law ? How readest thou ? He answering said : Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind ; and thy neighbour as thyself. And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right. *This do, and thou shalt live.*" *Matthew*, ch. vii. ver. 21 : " Not every one that saith unto me, Lord ! Lord ! shall enter into the

Digitized by Google

kingdom of heaven ; but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven. Many will say unto me in that day, Lord! Lord! have we not prophesied in thy name ; and in thy name have cast out devils ; and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them I never knew you ; depart from me, ye that work iniquity. Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, who built his house upon a rock ; and every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, who built his house upon the sand." *Luke*, ch. xi. ver. 27: " Blessed is the womb (said a certain woman to Jesus) that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked: but he said, Yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it." *John*, ch. xv. ver. 12 :-" This is my commandment, that ye love one another, as I have loved you." Ver. 17: "These things I command you, that ye love one another." Ch. xiii. ver. 34 : " A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another;" 35, " By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another." Observing those two commandments, (*Matt*. ch. xxii. ver. 37, 38, and 39,) selected by the Saviour as a substitute for all the Law and the Prophets, and sufficient means to produce peace and happiness to mankind, the Compiler never scrupled to follow the example

Digitized by Google

set forth by Jesus himself in compiling such precepts as include those two commandments, and their subsidiary moral doctrines, as a true substitute of the Gospel, without intending to depreciate the rest of the word of God. I regret that the Reverend Editor should have disapproved of this compilation, on the ground that " it is of importance that every compilation be given as a sample of the Sacred Writings in all their excellence and importance, and not as a substitute for the whole."

The authority of St. Paul, the most exalted among the primitive Christians, quoted by the Reverend Editor, (page 89,) " If righteousness come by the law, Christ is dead in vain," is not, I presume, adequate, to set aside, nor even applicable to the express authority of the Author of Christianity already quoted; as the latter includes not only the Mosaic law, to which St. Paul alludes, but both law and religion, as is evident from the following passages: " Therefore all things whatever you would that men should do to you, do you even so to men; for this is the Law and the Prophets." "On these two commandments (to love God and to love our neighbours) hang all the Law and the Prophets." Every one must admit, that the gracious Saviour meant by the words " the Law and the Prophets," all the divine commandments found in the Scriptures, obedience to which is strictly required of us by the founder of that religion. *Luke*, ch. xi. ver. 28: " Blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it."

Digitized by Google

John, ch. xiv. ver. 15 : "If you love me, keep my commandments." Had the manifestation of love towards God with all our strength, and towards our neighbours as ourselves, been practically impossible, as maintained by the Editor, (page 112,) or had any other doctrines been necessary to lead to eternal life, Jesus of Nazareth, (in whose veracity, candour, and perfection, we have happily been persuaded to place implicit confidence,) could not, consistently with his office as the Christ of God, have enjoined the lawyer to the obedience of those two commandments, and would not have promised him eternal life as the reward of such obedience ; (*vide Luke*, ch. x. ver. 28, "*this do and thou shalt live* ;") for a man possessed of common sense and common humanity would not incite another to labour in vain by attempting what was practically impossible, nor delude him with promises of a reward upon conditions beyond his power to fulfil ; much less could a Being, in whom dwelt all truth, and who was sent with a divine law to guide mankind by his preaching and example, inculcate precepts that it was impracticable to follow. Any commandment enjoining man to love God with all his heart and all his strength, requires of us of course to direct our love towards him as the sole Father of the Universe ; but does not amount to a prohibition of the pursuits necessary for life, or to an abstinence from love towards any other object ; for such love also is enjoined by the subsequent commandment. The following passa-

Digitized by Google

ges, *John*, ch. xiv. ver. 21, "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father; and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him:" Ch. xv. ver 10, "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love:" ver. 14, "Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you," &c., and many other passages of a similar import, exhibit clearly, that love of, and adherence to Jesus, can be evinced solely by obedience to the divine commandments. But if the observance of those commandments be treated as practically impossible, the love of Jesus and adherence to him must likewise be so considered, and Christianity altogether regarded as existing only in theory.

I appeal to the Reverend Editor himself, whether we are to set at defiance the express commandments of Jesus, under the supposition that manifestation of the love enjoined by him is practically impossible? Yet this we must do, if we are to adopt the position of the Editor, found in his Review, page 111, "that the most excellent precepts, the most perfect law, can never lead to happiness and peace, unless by causing men to take refuge in the doctrine of the cross;" meaning, I presume, the doctrine of the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus on the cross, as an atonement for the sins of mankind.

As the Reverend Editor has most fairly and justly confined himself to arguments, founded on the authority of the divine Teacher himself, I

Digitized by Google

should hope to be allowed to beg him to point out, in order to establish his position, even a single passage pronounced by Jesus, enjoining a refuge in such a doctrine of the cross, as all-sufficient or indispensable for salvation ; so that his position, thus supported, may be placed in competition with that founded on those passages which I have quoted in the foregoing paragraph, showing both the indispensableness and the all-sufficiency of the excellent Precepts in question to procure salvation ; and may impel us to endeavour to reconcile contradictions, which would in that case be shown to subsist between the passages, declaring the all-sufficiency of the moral precepts preached by Christ for eternal life, and those that might be found to announce the indispensableness of the doctrine of the cross for everlasting happiness.

It is however evident, that the human race are naturally so weak, and so prone to be led astray, by temptations of temporary gratifications, that the best and wisest of them fall far short of manifesting a strict obedience to the divine commandments, and are constantly neglecting the duty they owe to the Creator and to their fellow creatures ; nevertheless, in reliance on numerous promises found in the sacred writings, we ought to entertain every hope of enjoying the blessings of pardon from the merciful Father through repentance, which is declared the only means of procuring forgiveness of our failures. I have already quoted some of these comforting passages in my Appeal, page 110 ; but as the Reverend Editor seems to

Digitized by Google

have entirely overlooked them, and omitted to notice them in any of his publications, I deem it necessary to repeat them here with a few additions. *Ezekiel*, chap. xviii. ver. 30: "Repent and turn yourselves from all your transgressions, so iniquity shall not be your ruin." *Luke*, chap. xiii. ver. 3: "Except you repent, you shall all likewise perish." Chap. xv. ver. 7: "I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine persons who need no repentance." *Matthew*, chap. ix. ver. 13: "I am come not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." Chap. iii. ver. 2, John the baptist preached, saying, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand;" and Jesus, after his resurrection, lastly, directs his disciples, *Luke*, chap. xxiv. ver. 47, "That repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem," wherein he declares the remission of sins as an immediate and necessary consequence of repentance.

The foregoing authorities and remarks will, I trust, suffice with every candid reader, as my apology for persisting in the conviction, that the Precepts compiled and published as a guide to peace and happiness, though deficient in respect to speculative doctrines and creeds, as well as narrative, yet contain all that is essential in practical Christianity; since they teach us the performance of our duty to God and to our fellow creatures, and the most acceptable atonement on our part to the All-merciful, when we have fallen short of that duty.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER II.

Natural Inferiority of the Son to the Father.

In endeavouring to prove what he represents as "the most abstruse, and yet the most important of doctrines, the Deity of Jesus Christ," the Reverend Editor advances seven positions: 1st, that Jesus was possessed of ubiquity, an attribute peculiar to God alone. 2ndly, That he declared that a knowledge of his nature was equally incomprehensible with that of the nature of God. 3dly, That he exercised the power of forgiving sins, the peculiar prerogative of God. 4thly, That he claimed almighty power, "in the most unequivocal manner." 5thly, That his heavenly Father had committed to him the final judgment of all who have lived since the creation. 6thly, That he received worship due to God alone. 7thly, That he associated his own name with that of God the Father in the sacred rite of baptism. The facts on which the Editor labours to establish these positions, however, seem to me, upon an impartial examination, not only unfavourable to his inference, but even confirmatory of the opposite opinion. For, admitting for a moment that the positions of the Editor are well founded, and that the Saviour was in possession of attributes and powers

Digitized by Google

ascribed to God; have we not his own express and often repeated avowal, that all the powers he manifested were committed to him as the Son, by the Father of the Universe? And does not reason force us to infer, that a Being who owes to another all his power and authority, however extensive and high, should be in reality considered inferior to that other? Surely, therefore, those who believe God to be Supreme, possessing the perfections of all attributes, independently of all other beings, must necessarily deny the identity of Christ with God: as the sun, although he is the most powerful and most splendid of all known created things, the greatest immediate source of life and enjoyment in this world, has yet no claim to be considered identical in nature with God, who has given to the sun all the light and animating warmth which he sheds on our globe. To effect a material change without the aid of physical means, is a power peculiar to God; yet we find this power exercised by several of the prophets on whom the gift of miracles was bestowed. Besides, it is evident, from the first chapter of Genesis, that in the beginning of the creation God bestowed on man his own likeness, and sovereignty over all living creatures. Was not his own likeness and that dominion peculiar to God, before mankind were made partakers of them? Did God then deify man by such mark of distinction?

The following passages, I presume, suffice to illustrate the entire dependence of the Son on

God, and his inferiority and subjection to, and his living by him. *St. John*, ch. x. vers. 17 and 18: "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. *This commandment have I received of my Father.*" Chap. xii. ver. 49: "For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father *who sent me, he gave me the commandment* what I should say, and what I should speak." Chap. xiv. ver. 31: "But that the world may know that I love the Father, and *as the Father gave me commandment, even so I do.*" Chap. xvii. vers. 1 and 2, Jesus in his prayer—"Glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee; *as thou hast given him power over* all flesh, that he should give eternal life *to as many as thou hast given him.*" *John*, chap. iii. ver. 35: "The Father loveth the Son, and *hath given all things* into his hand." Chap. v. ver. 19: "*The Son can do nothing of himself*, but what he seeth the Father do," &c. 22: "For the Father judgeth no man, but *hath committed* all judgment unto the Son." 30: "*I can of mine own self do nothing:* as I hear I judge; and my judgment is just; because *I seek not my own will, but the will of the Father who hath sent me.*" Chap. vi. ver. 37: "All that the *Father giveth me shall come to me*," &c. 38: "For I came down from heaven, *not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.*" Chap. viii. ver. 28: "*That I do nothing*

Digitized by Google

of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things." Ver. 50: "I seek not my own glory; there is one that seeketh and judgeth." Chap. xiv. ver. 24: "The word which ye hear is not mine, *but the Father's which sent me.*" Ver. 31: "*As the Father gave me commandment, even* so I do." And after his resurrection Jesus saith, Ch. xx. ver. 21, "*As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.*" Ver. 17: "I ascend unto *my Father* and *your Father, to my God* and *your God.*" *Matthew,* ch. xii. ver. 18, from Isaiah: "Behold *my servant, whom I have chosen;* my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased; *I will put my spirit upon him,* and he shall show judgment to the Gentiles." Ch. xxviii. ver. 18: "And Jesus came and spoke unto them, saying, *All power is given unto me* in heaven and in earth." *Luke,* ch. i. ver. 32: "He shall be great, and shall be called *the Son of the Highest:* and the *Lord God shall give unto him* the throne of his father David." For testimony that he lived by the Father, see *John* vi. 57: "As the living Father *hath sent me, and I live by the Father,*" &c. Ch. v. ver. 26: "For as the Father hath life in himself, *so hath he given to the Son* to have life in himself."

As the Reverend Editor in two instances quoted, perhaps inadvertently, the authority of the Apostles, I think myself justified in introducing some of the sentiments entertained by them on this subject, though I should be contented to deduce my

Digitized by Google

arguments, as proposed by the Editor, exclusively from the direct authority of Jesus himself. I shall confine myself to the quotation of one or two texts from the Epistles of St. Paul. 1st *Corinthians*, ch. xv. vers. 24—28: "Then cometh the end, when he shall have *delivered up the kingdom to God*, even the Father. For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith, all things are put under him, it is manifest that *he is excepted which did put all things under him*. And when all things shall be subdued under him, then shall *the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him*, that God may be all in all." *Colossians*, ch. i. ver. 15: "Who is the image of the invisible God, *the first-born of every creature*."

From a due attention to the purport of the above quoted texts, and to the term *Son*, distinctly mentioned in them, the reader will, I trust, be convinced, that those powers were conferred on Jesus, and declared by himself to have been received by him from the Father, as the Messiah, Christ, or anointed Son of God, and not solely in his human capacity; and that such interpretation as declares these and other passages of a similar effect to be applicable to Jesus as a man, is an unscriptural invention. Jesus spoke of himself throughout all the Scriptures only as the promised Messiah, vested with high glory from the beginning of

Digitized by Google

the world. *John*, ch. xvii. ver. 5: "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." In this passage, with the same breath with which he prays for glory, he identifies *the nature* in which he does so with that under which he lived with God before the creation of the world, and of course before his assuming the office of the Messiah. Ver. 24: "Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me *be with me, where I am;* that they may behold *my glory, which thou hast given me:* for thou *lovedst me before the foundation of the world.*" Here again Jesus prays, that his Apostles may witness such honour as the Father had bestowed on him, even before the foundation of the world. Ch. ix. vers. 35—37: "Dost thou" (says Jesus to a man who had been blind) "believe on the *Son of God?* He answered and said, Who is he, Lord, that I might believe on him? And Jesus said unto him, Thou hast both *seen him, and it is he* (the Son of God) *that talketh with thee.*" Ch. xvii. vers. 1, 2: "Father, glorify *thy Son;* as *thou hast given him* power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as *thou hast given him.*" John the Baptist, who bore witness of Christ, looked not upon him in any other view than as the Son of God. *St. John*, ch. i. ver. 34: "And I saw and bare record," (said John the Baptist, pointing out the person of Jesus,) "that *this is the Son of God.*" *John*, ch. viii. ver. 42: "I proceeded forth and came from God;

Digitized by Google

neither came I of myself, but he sent me." And in numerous passages Jesus declares, that, before he assumed the office of the Messiah in this world, he was entirely subject to and obedient to the Father, from whom he received the commission to come to this world for the salvation of mankind. But apparently with the very view of anticipating any misapprehension of his nature on the part of his disciples, to whom he had declared the wonderful extent of the powers committed to him by the Father, he tells them, *John*, ch. xiv. ver. 28, "The Father is greater than I." It would have been idle to have informed them of a truth, of which, as Jews, they would never have entertained the smallest question, that in his mere corporeal nature Jesus was inferior to his Maker; and it must therefore have been his spiritual nature, of which he here avowed the inferiority to that of God.

"The Son" is a term which, when used without being referred to another proper name found in the context, implies invariably the Son of God throughout the whole New Testament, especially when associated with the epithet "The Father;" so the latter epithet, when it stands alone, signifies "the Father of the universe." *Matthew*, ch. xxviii. ver. 19: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Ch. xi. ver. 27: "No man knoweth the Son but the Father," &c. Vide rest of the Gospel.—It is true indeed, that the angels of God, and some of the ancients of the

Digitized by Google

human race, as well as the children of Israel, are honoured in the sacred writings with the name of "Sons of God.". *Job*, ch. i. ver. 6: "There was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord." *Genesis*, ch. vi. ver. 2: "The sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they were fair." *Hosea*, ch. i. ver. 10: "Then it shall be said unto them, ye are *the sons of the living God*." Yet the epithet "Son of God," with the definite article prefixed, is appropriated to Christ, the first-born of every creature, as a distinct mark of honour which *he alone* deserves.

The Saviour having declared that unity existed between the Father and himself, *John*, ch. x. ver. 30, "I and my Father are one," a doubt arose with regard to the sense in which the unity affirmed in those words should be accepted. This Jesus removes by defining the unity so expressed as a subsisting concord of will and design, such as existed amongst his Apostles, and not identity of being: vide ch. xvii. ver. 11, of John, "Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, *that they may be one, as we are*." Ver. 22: "The glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that *they may be one, even as we are one*." Should any one understand by these texts real unity and identity, he must believe that there existed a similar identity between each and all of the Apostles;—nay, even that the disciples also were included in the Godhead, which in that case would consist of a great many times the num-

Digitized by Google

ber of persons ascribed to the Trinity. *John*, ch. xvii. vers. 20—23 : " Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word—That *they all may be one ;* as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us.—That *they may be one, even as we are one. I in them, and thou in me :* that they may be made *perfect in one.*" I know not how it is possible for those who profess obedience to the word of Christ to overlook the explanation he has here so clearly given of the nature of the unity existing between him and the Father, and to adopt a contrary system, apparently introduced by some Heathen writers to suit their polytheistical prejudices ; but I doubt not the Editor of the Friend of India will admit the necessity of giving preference to divine authority over any human opinion, however prevailing it may be.

The Saviour meant unity in design and will by the assertion also, that he was in God, or dwelt in God, and God in him. *John*, ch. x. ver. 38 : " That ye may know, and believe, that the Father is in me, and I in him," as evidently appears from the following passages :—*John*, ch. xiv. ver. 20 : " At that day ye shall know," (addressing his Apostles,) " that I am in my Father, and *ye in me, and I in you.*" Ch. xvii. ver. 21 : " That they all may be one ; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be *one in us.*" *John*, ch. vi. ver. 56 : " He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, *dwelleth in me, and I in him.*" 1 *John*,

Digitized by Google

ch. iv. ver. 15 : "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God—God *dwelleth in him, and he in God.*" There appear but three modes in which such passages are capable of interpretation. 1st, As conveying the doctrine that the Supreme being, the Son and the Apostles, were to be absorbed mutually as drops of water into one whole ; which is conformable to the doctrines of that sect of Hindoo metaphysicians, who maintain, that in the end the human soul is absorbed into the Godhead ; but is quite inconsistent with the faith of all denominations of Christians. 2dly, As proving an identity of nature, with distinction of person, between the Father, the Son, and the Apostles ; a doctrine equally inconsistent with the belief of every Christian, as multiplying the number of persons of the Godhead far beyond what has ever been proposed by any sect : or 3dly, As expressing *that unity* which is said to exist wherever there are found perfect concord, harmony, love, and obedience, such as the Son evinced towards the Father, and taught the disciples to display towards the divine will.—That the language of our Saviour can be understood in this last sense solely, will, I trust, be readily acknowledged by every candid expounder of the sacred writings, as being the only one alike warranted by the common use of words, and capable of apprehension by the human understanding. Had not experience, indeed, too clearly proved that such metaphorical expressions, when taken singly and without atten-

Digitized by Google

tion to their contexts, may be made the foundation of doctrines quite at variance with the tenor of the rest of the Scriptures, I should have had no hesitation in submitting indiscriminately the whole of the doctrines of the New Testament to my countrymen; as I should have felt no apprehension that even the most ignorant of them, if left to the guidance of their own unprejudiced views of the matter, could misconceive the clear and distinct assertions they every where contain of the unity of God and subordinate nature of his messenger Jesus Christ. Many of these have been already quoted; to which may be added the following: *John*, ch. xvii. ver. 3: "This is life eternal, that they might know *thee the only true God*, and Jesus Christ *whom thou hast sent*." Here Jesus in addressing the Father declares, that the means to be afforded for eternal salvation, were a knowledge of God, and of himself as the anointed messenger of God. Also, ch. xix. ver. 17, Christ saith, "Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is God." Here Jesus, pure as he was and without reproach, thinks it necessary to check the man who applies to him an epithet justly due to God only. Ch. xiv. ver. 1: "Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God; believe *also* in me." In these words Jesus commands his disciples to put their trust in God, and further to believe in him as the Messenger of God; and thus plainly distinguishes himself from the Godhead. Nor can it for a moment be understood by the following passage,

Digitized by Google

John, ch. xiv. ver. 9, "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father," that God was literally and materially visible in the Son—a doctrine which would be directly contrary to the spirit of the religion taught by Jesus, and by all the prophets of God. Vide *John*, ch. iv. ver. 24: "God is a Spirit." The Apostles also maintained a belief of the immateriality and invisibility of God. 1 *Tim.* ch. vi. ver. 16: "Whom no man hath seen nor can see." 1 *John*, ch. iv. ver. 12: "No man hath seen God at any time." Besides, Jesus explains himself in the two passages immediately succeeding, that by the phrase, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," he meant only that whosoever saw him and the works performed by him, witnessed proofs of the entire concord of his words and actions with the will and design of the Father, and ought therefore to have admitted the truth of his mission from God. *John*, ch. xiv. ver. 9: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father. How sayest thou then, Shew us the Father?" Ver. 10: "Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? The words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself; but the Father, that dwelleth in me he doeth the works." Ver. 11: "Believe me, that I am in the Father, and the Father in me: or else believe me for the very works' sake." We have already seen in what sense the expression "dwelleth in me" must be understood, unless we admit that all true followers of Christ are admitted as portions of the Godhead. *John*, ch. vi. ver. 56:

Digitized by Google

"He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him." 1 *John*, ch. iv. ver. 12: "If we love one another, God dwelleth in us."

For my conviction, and for the satisfaction of those who consider the Precepts of Jesus as a guide to peace and happiness, his word, "They may be one as we are." *John*, ch. xvii. ver. 11, indefining the nature of the unity between God and Jesus, fully suffices. Disgusted with the puerile and unsociable system of Hindoo idolatry, and dissatisfied at the cruelty allowed by Moossulmanism against Nonmoossulmans, I, on my searching after the truth of Christianity, felt for a length of time very much perplexed with the difference of sentiments found among the followers of Christ, (I mean Trinitarians and Unitarians, the grand divisions of them,) until I met with the explanation of the unity given by the divine Teacher himself as guide to peace and happiness. Besides, when the Jews misunderstood the phrase used by the Saviour, "I and my Father are one," and accused him of blasphemy, (ch. x. ver. 33, "But for blasphemy, and because that thou, being a man, makest thy self God,") Jesus, in answer to the accusation, denied having made himself God, saying, vers. 34—36, "Is it not written in your Law, I said, Ye are Gods? If he called them Gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken; say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because *I said, I am the Son of God?*"

Digitized by Google

How was it possible that Jesus, the founder of truth and true religion, should have *disavowed* the charge of making himself God by representing himself as the *Son*, honoured with sanctification *by the Father*, and *sent by him* to this world, if he were the true living God, possessed of everlasting sanctification, independently of another being? From this and all other local evidence, the Pharisees and chief priests, though inveterate enemies of the Saviour, accused him to Pilate of having made himself the son of God and King of the Jews; but relinquished the charge of making himself equal to God, or having ascribed to himself divine nature; although the latter (i. e. making himself God) was better calculated to excite the horror of the people. Vide *John*, ch. xix. ver 7: "The Jews answered him, We have a law, and by our law he ought to die; because he made himself the Son of God." Vide *Matthew*, ch. xxvii. ver. 37: "And set up over his head his accusation written, "This is Jesus, the King of the Jews." 43: "HE TRUSTED IN GOD; let him deliver him now, if he will have him: for he said, I am the Son of God." That the epithet God is frequently applied in the sacred Scriptures otherwise than to the Supreme Being, as pointed out by Jesus, may be shown by the following, out of many instances to be found in the Bible. *Deut.* ch. x. ver. 17: "For the Lord your God is GOD OF GODS, and Lord of Lords," &c. Ch. xxxii. ver. 21; "They have moved me to jealousy with *that*

Digitized by Google

which is not God." *Exodus*, ch. xii. ver. 28: "*Thou shalt not revile the Gods*, nor curse the ler of thy people." *Joshua*, ch. xxii. ver. 22: "The Lord *God of Gods* knoweth." *Psalm* lxxxii. ver. 1: "God standeth in the congregation of the mighty: *he judgeth among the Gods.*" 6: "I have said, *Ye are Gods*; and all of you are children of the most High." *Ps.* cxxxvi. ver. 2: "O give thanks unto *the God of Gods.*" *Isaiah*, ch. xli. ver. 23: "Show the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know *that ye are Gods.*" *Psalm* xcvii. ver. 7: "*Worship him, all ye Gods.*" *Zephaniah*, ch. ii. ver. 11: "He *will famish all the Gods of the earth.*" *Exodus*, ch. iv. ver. 16: "God said to Moses, that he should be to Aaron *instead of God.*" Ch. vii. ver. 5: "See, *I have made thee a God* to Pharaoh." Also 1 *Corinth.* ch. viii. ver. 5: "As *there be Gods many* and Lords many;" and the verse already quoted from *John*, ch. x. vers. 34, 35: "Jesus answered, Is it not written in your Law, *Ye are Gods?* If he *call them Gods, to whom the word of God came,*" &c. In none of these instances is it in any degree admissible, that by the epithet God it is implied, that the human beings to whom it was attached were thereby declared to be a portion of the Godhead. Moses was to be as a God to Aaron and a God to Pharaoh, by the express command of the Almighty; but no Christian will thence argue the equality of Moses with the Father of all things. On what

Digitized by Google

principle, then, can any stress be laid in defence of the deity of the Son on the prophetic expression quoted in Hebrews from Psalm xlv. ver. 6, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever;" especially when we find in the next verse, words that declare his subordinate nature; "Thou lovest righteousness and hatest wickedness: therefore *God, thy God,* hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows?" We cannot allow much weight to the phrase "for ever," as establishing literally the eternal nature of the power of the Son, this phrase being often found metaphorically applied in the Scriptures to other created beings: as *Proverbs*, ch. xxix. ver. 14: "The king that faithfully judgeth the poor; his throne shall be established for ever." *Deut.* ch. iv. ver. 40: "And that thou mayest prolong thy days in the earth, which the Lord thy God giveth thee, for ever." Similar to this is the remarkable expression of Jesus to Mary after his resurrection, and therefore, at a time when no design can be conceived to have existed that could have been advanced by his any longer withholding the knowledge of his true nature, if any thing remained unrevealed during the previous period of his mission on earth. *John*, ch. xx. ver. 17: "Go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto *my Father and your Father,* and to *my God* and *your God.*"

After a slight attention to the terms Lord and God being often applied to men in the Sacred Wri-

Digitized by Google

tings, can any weight be allowed to the exclamation of the astonished disciple, *John*, ch. xx. ver. 28, "My Lord and my God;" especially as the apostle who relates the circumstance, within a few verses concludes by saying, ver. 31, "These are written that ye might believe that *Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God*;" but nowhere desirest he readers of his Gospel to believe that Jesus is God? Does not common sense point out the inferiority and subordination of a being, though called God, to one who is at the same time declared to be *his* God, *his* Father, *his* Sanctifier, and *his* Promoter to the state of exaltation?

The passage, *John*, ch. i. ver. 1, "The word was God, and the Word was with God," which contains the term God twice, may, according to such use of the term, be interpreted without involving inconsistence with itself, or the contradiction which it apparently implies with another most decisive passage in *Deut.* ch. xxxii. ver. 39, where Moses representeth God as declaring, that *with* him there is no God: "See now that I, even I am he; and *there is no God with me*;" if it should be understood to signify in both instances the Supreme Deity. Should we follow, on the other hand, the interpretation adopted by Trinitarian Christians, namely, that the Godhead though it is one, yet consists of three persons, and consequently one substance of the Godhead, might abide with the other, both being equally God; we should in that case be forced to view the God-

Digitized by Google

head in the same light as we consider mankind and other genera, for no doubt can exist of the unity of mankind :—the plurality of men consists in their persons ; and therefore we may safely, under the same plea, support the unity of man, notwithstanding the plurality of persons included under the term mankind. In that case also Christians ought in conscience to refrain from accusing Hindoos of Polytheism ; for every Hindoo we daily observe confesses the unity of the Godhead. They only advance a plausible excuse for their Polytheism, which is, that notwithstanding the unity of the Godhead, it consists of millions of substances assuming different offices correspondent to the number of the various transactions superintended in the universe by Divine Providence, which they consider as infinitely more numerous than those of the Trinitarian scheme.

The Saviour in his appeal, " If I do not the works of my Father believe me not," *John*, ch. x. ver. 37, meant of course the performance of works prescribed by the Father, and tending to his glory. A great number of passages in the Scriptures, a few of which I have already cited, and the constant practice of the Saviour, illustrate this fact beyond doubt. In raising Lazarus after he had died, Jesus prayed to the Father for the power of bringing him to life again, and thanked him for his compliance. *John*, ch. xi. ver. 41 : " And Jesus lifted up his eyes and said, Father,

Digitized by Google

I thank thee that thou hast heard me." Besides, in declaring that whosoever believed [in] him would do not only the works he performed, but even works of greater importance, Jesus can never be supposed to have promised to such believers equality in power with God, or to have exalted them above himself. *John*, ch. xiv. ver. 12: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also, and greater works than these shall he do." Ch. vi. ver. 29: "Jesus answered and said unto them, This is the work of God, that ye *believe* on him whom he hath sent." It must be admitted that one who can perform works of God independently of the Deity, is either greater than, or equal in power to the Almighty. The wonderful works which Jesus was empowered to perform drew a great number of the Jews to a belief in Jesus as the promised Messiah, and confirmed his apostles in their already acquired faith in the Saviour, and in the entire union of will and design that subsisted between him and the Father, as appears from the following passages: *John*, ch. vi. ver. 14, "Then those men, when they had seen the miracle that Jesus did, said, This is of a truth that *Prophet that should come into the world.*" See also, *John*, ch. x. ver. 21.

The Scriptures indeed in several places declare, that the Son was superior even to the angels in heaven, living from the beginning of the world to eternity, and that the Father created all things

Digitized by Google

by him and for him. At the same time I must, in conformity to those very authorities, believe him as produced by the Supreme Deity among created beings. *John*, ch. v. ver. 26: "For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." *Colossians*, ch. i. ver. 15: "Who is the image of the invisible God, the *first born of every creature.*"

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER III.

Separate Consideration of the Seven Positions of the Reviewer.

In attempting to support his first position, that Jesus was possessed of ubiquity, the Reverend Editor has quoted two passages. The first is, *St. John*, ch. iii. ver. 13 : " No man has ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man who is in heaven ;" Wherein Jesus, as the Editor conceives, declares his location both in heaven and on the earth at one time. The Editor rests entirely the force of his argument upon the term "is," in the above phrase " who *is* in heaven," as signifying the presence of Jesus in heaven while he was conversing with Nicodemus on earth. This argument might perhaps carry some weight with it, were not the frequent use of the present tense in a preterite or future sense observed in the Sacred Writings, and were not a great number of other passages to determine that the term "is," in this instance, must be understood in the past sense. *John*, ch. viii. ver. 58 : " Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, *I am*." Here the same verb, though found in the form of the present tense, must obviously be taken in a preterite sense. *John*, ch. ix. ver.

Digitized by Google

8 : " His disciples say unto him, Master, the Jews of late sought to stone thee," &c. ; that is, His disciples *said* unto him. Ver. 38 : " Jesus therefore again groaning in himself *cometh* to the grave," *i. e.* he *came* to the grave. *Matthew*, ch. xxvi. ver. 2 : " Ye know that after two days is the feast of the passover, and the Son of man *is* be-betrayed to be crucified ; that is, the Son of man *is to be* betrayed and to be crucified. *Vide* the remainder of the chapter. *John*, ch. xiii. ver. 6 : " Then *cometh* he to Simon Peter, &c." that is, *he came* to Simon Peter, &c. Again, *John*, ch. xvi. ver. 32 : " That ye shall be scattered, every man to his own, and shall leave me alone : yet *I am* not alone :" *i. e.* yet *I shall not be* alone. So in all the prophecies contained in the Old, as well as in the New Testament, the future tense must frequently be understood where the terms used are those grammatically appropriated to the preterite : as *Matthew*, ch. ii. ver. 18, " In Rama *was* there a voice heard," that is, *will there be* a voice heard. Ver. 15, " Out of Egypt *have I called* my Son," *i. e.* I *will call* my son. After a diligent attention to the following passage, no one will, I presume, scruple to conclude that the Son was actually absent from heaven during his locality on the earth, and consequently the phrase quoted by the Editor is applicable only to the past time. *John*, ch. vi. ver. 62 : " What and if ye shall see the son of man ascend up where he *was* before." The verb *was*, accompanied with the

Digitized by Google

term *before* in this passage, positively implies the absence of Jesus from heaven during his stay on the earth. Ch. xvi. ver. 7: "Nevertheless I tell you the truth; it is expedient for you that I *go away*. If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if *I depart*, I will send him unto you." Ver. 5: "But now I *go* my way to him that sent me." Ver. 28: "*I came forth* from the Father, and am *come* into the world: again, I *leave* the world, and *go* to the Father." Ch. xiii. ver. 36: "Jesus answered him, Whither I *go*, thou canst not follow me now, but thou shalt *follow* me afterwards." Ch. xiii. ver. 1: "Jesus knew that his hour was come that he should *depart out* of this world unto the Father." For further conviction, I may safely refer even to the preceding terms of the verse relied on by the Editor:—"No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man." For the attribute of omnipresence is quite inconsistent with the human notions of the ascent and descent effected by the Son of man. Is it possible to reconcile the contents of hundreds of such passages, consistent with reason and conformable to the established order of interpretation, to the apparent meaning of a single phrase, that, taken literally, is totally opposed to common sense? For to a being named *the Son*, or *the created*, (the one term implying the other,) and sent from one mansion to another, the attribute of ubiquity can never be justly ascribed.

Besides, in examining the original Greek Tes-

Digitized by Google

tament, we find in the phrase in question, "Who is in heaven," that the present partciple ὢν "being," is used in lieu of ἐστὶ, "is," viz. Ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ; a true translation of which should be "the *ens*" or "*being* in heaven;" and as the nominative case ὁ ὢν, "the being," requires a verb to complete the sense, it should be connected with the nearest verb ἀναβέβηκεν, "hath ascended," no other verb in fact existing in the sentence.

The whole verse in the original runs thus: Καὶ οὐδεὶς ἀναβέβηκεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ [ἐκ] τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβὰς, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ A verbal translation of the above would run thus: "And no one hath ascended into heaven, if not the out of heaven descender—the Son of man—the being in heaven;" which words, arranged according to the rules of English grammar, should run thus: "And no one, except the descender from heaven, the Son of man, the being in heaven, hath ascended into heaven." In this case, the presence of the Son in heaven must be understood as *referring* to the time of his ascent, and not to that of his addressing himself to Nicodemus—an explanation which, though it does not serve to establish the omnipresence of the Son urged by the Editor, ought to be satisfactory to an impartial mind.* The second passage which

* See Bishop Middleton's "Doctrine of the Greek Article," Part I. page 42, Note: "We are to refer the time of the participle to the time of the act, &c. implied in the verb; for past, present, and future cannot be meant otherwise than in respect to that act." Leviticus, ch. vii. ver. 23 [33]: Ὁ προσφέρων—αὐτῷ ἔσται ὁ βραχίων ὁ δεξιὸς, "The of-

Digitized by Google

the Editor quotes on this subject is, *Matthew*, ch. xviii. ver. 20: "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there *am* I am in the midst of them." Is it not evident that the Saviour meant here, by being in the midst of two or three of his disciples, his guidance to them when joined in searching for the truth, without preferring any claim to ubiquity? We find similar expressions in the Scriptures, wherein the guidance of the Prophets of God is also meant by words that would imply their presence. *Luke*, ch. xvi. ver. 29: "Abraham saith unto him, *They have* Moses and the Prophets; let them hear them." No one will suppose that this expression is intended to signify that the Jews actually had Moses and the Prophets in person among them, or that they could hear them speak in the literal and not in the figurative sense of the words; nor can any one deduce the omnipresence of Moses and the Prophets from such expressions.

The second position advanced by the Reverend

fering (person) for him shall be the right shoulder." Ch. xiv. ver. 47: 'Ο ἐσθίων—πλυνεῖ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, "The eating (person) shall wash his clothes." These present participles are referred to a time present with respect to the act of the verbs connected with them; but future with respect to the command of God. John, ch. i. ver. 49: Ὄντα—εἶδόν σε, "I saw thee when thou wast." Moreover, we frequently find the present participle used in the past sense, even without reference to the time of the verb. John, ch. ix. ver. 25: Τυφλὸς ὢν ἄρτι βλέπω, "Being blind, now I see," that is, "Having been blind, now I see."

Editor is, that "Jesus ascribes to himself a knowledge and incomprehensibility of nature equal to that of God, and peculiar to God alone?" and in attempting to substantiate this point, he quotes *Matthew*, ch. xi. ver. 27, "No man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." Here the Editor seems to rest on two grounds; 1st, That God is incomprehensible to man; 2ndly, That incomprehensibility of nature is peculiar to God alone:—whence the Reverend Editor draws his inference, that Jesus, knowing the nature of God, and being himself possessed of an incomprehensible nature, is equal with God. Now I should wish to know if the Editor, by the term "incomprehensible," understands a total impossibility of comprehension in any degree, or only the impossibility of attaining to a perfect knowledge of God. If the former, I must be under the necessity of denying such a total incomprehensibility of the Godhead; for the very passage cited by the Editor, declares God to be comprehensible not to the Son alone, but also to every one who would receive revelation from the Son; and in this case the latter part of the passage, "*He to whomsoever the Son will reveal him*," must be acknowledged as conveying an exception to the assertion made in the former part of the sentence, "Neither knoweth *any man* the Father," &c.

We find also the following passages in *John*,

Digitized by Google

ch. xiv. vers. 16, 17: "And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever: even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: *but ye know him*;"—wherein Jesus ascribes to his disciples a knowledge of the Holy Ghost, whom the Editor considers one of the persons of the Godhead, possessed of the same nature with God. But if the Editor understands by the passage he has quoted, the incomprehensibility of the real nature of the Godhead, I admit the position, but deny his inference, that such an incomprehensibility proves the nature of the object to be divine, as being peculiar to God alone: for it appears evident that a knowledge of the real nature even of a common leaf, or a visible star, surpasses human comprehension; how then can a simple assertion, setting forth the incomprehensibility of an object, be considered as establishing its identity with God? In *Mark*, ch. xiii. ver. 32, "But of that day and that hour *knoweth* no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the *Son*, but the Father," we have a passage, which, though it affirms in a stronger manner an *ignorance of the day* of resurrection than that already quoted does of God, yet will not, I presume, be considered by any one as conveying the slightest insinuation of the divine nature of that day; though time is a common object of adoration amongst idolaters. In treating of this point, the Editor quotes another

Digitized by Google

text, *Matthew*, ch. xi. ver. 28, "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest;" wherein Jesus declares his power of affording rest, which the Editor considers as peculiar to God. All the prophets, as well as Jesus, were from time to time sent by the Almighty to afford mental rest to mankind, by imparting to them the comforts of divine revelation; and by so doing they only fulfilled the commission given by God: but no one ever supposed that in so doing they established claims to be considered incarnations of the Divine essence. *Proverbs*, ch. xxix. ver. 17: "Correct thy son, and he shall give thee rest; yea, he shall give delight unto thy soul." Revelation guides us to a sure belief that it is God that affords peace of mind, effects cures of the body, and bestows all sorts of comforts on his creatures. "I thank thee," (says Jesus, *Matthew*, ch. xi. ver. 25,) "O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes." Both our perceptions, indeed, and sacred authorities point out, that he lavishes all these gifts on us through prophets, physicians, and other physical causes, that are not considered by any sect as of a divine nature.

The third position is, that Jesus exercised in an independent manner, the prerogative of forgiving sins, which is peculiar to God alone; and the Reverend Editor quotes the passage, *Mark*, ch. ii. ver. 5, "Thy sins be forgiven thee;" and the 9th

Digitized by Google

verse, "For whether is it easier to say, Thy sins be forgiven thee, or to say, Arise and walk?" Taking those texts as the grounds of his position, I therefore beg to call the attention of the Editor to the passage almost immediately following, in which the evangelical writer intimates, that this power of forgiving sins, as well as of healing men, was given by the Almighty: "But when the multitude saw it, they marvelled, and glorified God, *who had given* such power unto *men*." Does not this passage convey an express declaration, that Jesus was as much dependent on God in exercising the power of forgiving sins and healing the sick, as the prophets who came forth from God before him? The apostles, who witnessed the power of forgiving sins in the Saviour, were thoroughly impressed with a belief that it was the Almighty Father who forgave sins through the Son. *Acts*, ch. v. vers. 31, 32: "*Him hath God exalted* with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, *and forgiveness of sins.* And we are his witnesses of these things." Ch. xiii. ver. 38: "Be it known, therefore, men and brethren, that *through this man,* (meaning the Saviour,) is preached unto you the *forgiveness of sins.*" I know not how far religious zeal in the breasts of many of the followers of Christ may excuse them in encroaching upon the prerogatives which relation and reason ascribe to the Divine Majesty alone; but Jesus himself clearly avows, that the power of for-

Digitized by Google

giving sins had its source and origin in God alone, as appears from his petitioning the Father to forgive those that were guilty of bringing the death of the cross upon him, the greatest of all imaginable crimes. *Luke*, ch. xxiii. ver. 34: "Father, forgive them," (says Jesus,) "for they know not what they do;" and from his directing all those that followed him to pray the Father alone for forgiveness of sins. *Luke*, ch. xi. ver 4: "And forgive us our sins." *Matthew*, ch. vi. ver. 14: "If ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will forgive you."

The fourth position advanced by the Editor is, that "Almighty power is also claimed by Jesus in the most unequivocal manner." In endeavouring to demonstrate this, the Editor notices three passages of *John*, (ch. v. vers. 21—23,) "As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will. For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son: that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father." A candid inquirer after truth must, I think, feel surprised and disappointed, that in quoting these texts, the Editor should have overlooked the force of the words, in which the Son declares that he hath received the commission to judge from the Father: "For the Father judgeth no man, but *hath committed all judgment unto the Son.*" I am ready to admit, indeed, that, taken simply as they stand, the words, "As the Father raiseth up

Digitized by Google

the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will," and, "That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father," might very readily be understood as implying an assertion of equality with the Father. But this affords one of numerous instances of the danger of resting an opinion on the apparent meaning of the words of insulated passages of Scripture, without attention to the context; for I am convinced that no unprejudiced person can peruse the verses preceding and subsequent to those quoted by the Editor, without feeling that a more explicit disavowal of equality with God can hardly be expressed by language than that which they contain. I must therefore beg permission to give the entire passage in this place, though some parts of it have been quoted before in support of arguments already discussed. It is to be observed, that the occasion of the expressions here made use of by Jesus, was the accusation brought against him by the Jews, that he had made himself equal with God. *John*, ch. v. vers. 19—36: "Then answered Jesus, and said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, *The Son can do nothing of himself*, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise. For the Father loveth the Son, and showeth him all things that himself doeth: and he will show him greater works than these, that he may marvel. For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom

Digitized by Google

he will. For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son; that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father who hath sent him. Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and *believeth on him that sent me,* hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life. Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live. For as the Father hath life in himself, *so hath he given to the Son* to have life in himself; and *hath given him authority* to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man. Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the grave shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation. *I can of mine ownself do nothing: as I hear, I judge:* and my judgment is just, *because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father who hath sent me.* If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true. There is another that beareth witness of me; and I know that the witness which he witnesseth of me is true. Ye sent unto John, and he bare witness unto the truth. But I receive not testimony from man: but these things I say that ye might be saved. He was a burning and a shining light: and ye were willing for a season to rejoice in his light.

But I have greater witness than that of John: for the works which the *Father hath given me to finish*, the same works that I do, *bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me.*"

It would have been strange indeed, had Jesus, in repelling the accusation of blasphemy, which had wrought on the minds of the Jews so far that they sought to kill him, confirmed their assertion, that he made himself equal with God, and thus prematurely endangered his own life; but we find that so far from being further incensed by the explanation above quoted, they seem to have quietly acquiesced in his appeal to their own Scriptures, that the Messiah should have all the power and authority which he asserted the Father had given to himself. Ver. 46: "For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me." The only text in the writings of Moses that refers to the nature of the Messiah, is that of *Deuteronomy*, ch. xviii. vers. 15 and 18, quoted by St. Peter, in the Acts of the Apostles, ch. iii. ver. 22, and by St. Stephen, ch. vii. ver. 37, Moses said to the children of Israel, "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, *like unto me: unto him* ye shall hearken." The words which the Lord addressed to Moses were exactly of the same import: "I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, *like unto thee*," &c. It was, no doubt, to this remarkable passage that Jesus referred, and nothing can more distinctly prove the light in which he

Digitized by Google

wished to be considered, namely, that of a Messenger or Prophet of God. But this is not the only instance in which Jesus entirely disclaims the attribute of omnipotence. On many other particular occasions he declares, in the strongest language, his want of almighty power, and his constant need of divine influence. *Matthew*, ch. xx. ver. 23: "And he saith unto them, ye shall drink indeed of my cup, and be baptised with the baptism that I am baptised with: but to sit on my right hand, and on my left, *is not mine to give*; but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of my Father." Ch. xii. ver. 28: "But if I cast out devils *by the spirit of God*, then the kingdom of God is come unto you." Ch. xxvi. ver. 39: "And he went a little further, and fell on his face, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt." Ver. 42: "He went away again the second time, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if this cup may not pass away from me, except I drink it, thy will be done." *Luke*, ch. xxii. ver. 32: "But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not," &c. *John*, ch. xii. ver. 27: "Father, save me from this hour." Whosoever honours God, cannot I presume, consistently refuse to honour his Prophet, whom he dignified with the name of "Son of God;" and as he honours God, he will also honour that Prophet, though he be well aware of the distinction between the Almighty and his chosen Son. The honour paid to the Prophet may in this sense be fairly consi-

Digitized by Google

dered the test of the real degree of respect entertained for God—as Jesus saith, *Matthew*, ch. x. ver. 40, "He that receiveth you, receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me." The obvious meaning of which words is, As far as men listen to your instructions, they listen to mine, and in so far they receive the commandments of God who hath sent me. Prejudice alone could, I think, infer from such expressions, that those who received the Apostles were literally receiving God himself under their form and substance. Equally demonstrative of prejudice, I conceive, would it be to deduce the identity or equality of the Father and the Son from the following passage, *John*, ch. v. ver. 23: "That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father who hath sent him." For in this very passage the Son is represented as the Messenger of the Father, and for that reason only entitled to honour. That the preposition "as" implies here, as in many other places, likeness in nature and quality, and not in exact degree of honour, is illustrated by its obvious meaning in the last verse of *Matthew* v., "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect;" for by these words no one can conceive, that equality in degree of perfection between God and the disciples is intended to be enjoined.

The fifth position is, that his heavenly Father had committed to Jesus, the final judgment of all

Digitized by Google

who have lived since the creation. I readily admit the correctness of this position, and consider the fact as confirming the opinion maintained by me, and by numerous other followers of Christ, as to the Son's total dependence on the commission of God for his power in administering such judgment. I agree also with the Reverend Editor, in esteeming the nature of this office most important; and that nothing but the gift of supernatural wisdom can qualify a being to judge the conduct of thousands of millions of individuals, living at different times from the beginning of the world to the day of resurrection. It is however perfectly consistent with the omnipotence and wisdom of God, who is declared by revelation to be "able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham," (*Matthew*, ch. iii. ver. 9,) and with whom all things are possible, (*Luke*, ch. i. ver. 37,) to bestow wisdom equal to the important nature of this office on the first-born of every creature, whom he has anointed and exalted even above his angels. But the Editor goes much further than I am willing to follow him, in concluding the omniscience of the Son, from the circumstance of his distributing final judgment; since Jesus not only disclaimed that attribute, but even expressly avowed that he received his qualifications for exercising judgment from God. With respect to his declaiming omniscience, see *Mark*, ch. xiii. ver. 32: "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." Omniscience, as the Editor must be well aware, has no limit; but

Digitized by Google

here Jesus expressly declares, that he is ignorant of the day appointed by the Father for the resurrection and judgment. What words can be more expressly declaratory than these of the finite nature of the knowledge granted to Jesus, however its extent may actually surpass our limited capacity? As a proof that his judicial authority is derived from God, see *John*, chap. v. vers. 26 and 27: "For as the Father hath life in himself, so ***hath he given*** to the Son to have life in himself; and ***hath given him authority*** to execute judgment also." 30: "I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me." Is it possible to misunderstand the assertion contained in these words, that both the authority and the ability to judge are gifts bestowed on the Son by the omnipotent Father?

The sixth position is, that in several instances Jesus accepted worship "due to no man, but to God alone;" and instances of his receiving worship from a blind man, a leper, from mariners, and from his disciples, are adduced from the evangelical writings. Every one must admit that the word "worship," both in common acceptation and in the Scriptural writings, is used sometimes as implying an external mark of religious reverence paid to God, and at other times, as signifying merely the token of civil respect due to superiors; and that concurrent circumstances in every instance determine the real sense in which the word should be

Digitized by Google

taken. Among the Prophets of God, Jesus was not the only one that permitted himself to be worshipped, as we find Daniel the Prophet allowing himself such worship. *Daniel*, ch. ii. ver. 46: "Then the king Nebuchadnezzar fell upon his face, and worshipped Daniel." Daniel, like Jesus, neither rebuked the man who worshipped him, nor did he feel indignant at such a tribute of respect; yet we cannot find any subsequent assertion that he had offended God by suffering himself to be the object of the king's *worship* in this instance. Besides, Jesus himself uses the word worship in the latter sense, (I mean that of civil reverence,) in one of the evangelical parables, where he represents a servant as worshipping his master. *Matthew*, ch. xviii. ver. 26: "The servant therefore fell down and worshipped him." From the circumstance of Jesus positively commanding human beings to worship God alone in spirit, and not in any form or shape, either human or angelic; as *John*, ch. iv. ver. 24: "God is a Spirit; and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth;" *Matthew*, ch. iv. ver. 10: "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve;" and from the circumstance of his rebuking the man who called him "good master," on the ground that the term "good" should be peculiarly applied to God alone, (*Matt.* ch. xix. ver. 17,) we necessarily conclude that Jesus accepted worship only as a mark of human respect and acknowledgment of gratitude.

Digitized by Google

Let us moreover ascertain from the context, the sentiments which the blind man, the leper, the mariners, and the disciples of Jesus, entertained of his nature; and we can no longer hesitate to believe, that they meant by the worship they offered, only the manifestation of their reverence for him, as a superior indeed, yet still as a created being. The question is, Did those that offered worship to Jesus evince that they believed him to be God, or one of the three persons of the Godhead, and equal to God? Nothing of the kind—the blind man, after his cure, spoke of Jesus as a prophet, and a righteous man, and believed him when he said he was the Son of God. *John*, ch. ix. ver. 31: "Now we know" (says the blind man) "that God heareth not sinners: but if any man be a worshipper of God, and doeth his will, him he heareth." Ver. 33: "If this man were not of God, he could do nothing." And in answer to the question of Jesus, "Dost thou believe on the Son of God?" he answers, "Lord, I believe. And he worshipped him." ver. 38. The unclean spirit which is said in Mark to have worshipped Jesus, "Cried with a loud voice, and said, What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of the most high God? I *adjure thee by God*, that thou torment me not." *Mark*, ch. v. ver. 7. This adjuration would have been absurd if Jesus were himself addressed as God; and clearly shows, that the worship offered, was to deprecate the power of a being whose nature was subordinate

Digitized by Google

to that of God, by whose name he was adjured. The leper, too, glorified God, while to Jesus he gave only thanks for being the instrument of his cure. *Luke*, ch. xvii. vers. 15, 16: "And one of them, when he saw that he was healed, turned back, and with a loud voice glorified God, and fell down on his face at his feet, *giving him thanks.*" The mariners who worshipped Jesus, declared at the same instant, "Of a truth thou art the Son of God." *Matthew*, ch. xiv. ver. 33. The woman of Canaan, who is also stated in *Matthew*, ch. xv. ver. 25, to have worshipped Jesus, addressed him, ver. 22, as "the son of David," by which term she certainly would not have designated a being whom she worshipped as God. Peter, the most celebrated of his disciples, showed his faith in acknowledging Jesus merely as the Christ, or in other words with the same exact sense, *the anointed* of God—which is certainly far from implying "very God." *Mark*, ch. viii. 29. Even after crucifixion, we find the disciples conversing of Jesus only as "a prophet, mighty in deed and in word before God and all the people." *Luke*, ch. xxiv. ver. 19. It was Jesus himself risen from the dead whom they addressed, yet throughout the remainder of the chapter, which concludes with the account of his being carried up to heaven, they are only further taught that this prophet was the promised Messiah, but no means that it was their duty to worship him as God. Peter, in the name of all the disciples, declares, *John*, ch. vi. ver. 60, "We be-

Digitized by Google

lieve and are sure that thou art [that] Christ, the son of the living God." And as already observed, the disciple John declares, that the object of the gospel is, "that it may be believed that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." *John*, ch. xx. ver. 31. When the leper prayed to Jesus for cure, he addressed him only with the term Κυριε (*Matthew*, ch. viii. ver. 2, which in Greek is used as synonymous to Lord or Master, and often applied to superior persons.

Every Christian is morally bound to evince obedience to the commandments of Jesus, and exert himself to follow his example. It behooves us, therefore, to ascertain what his commandments are with regard to the object of sacred worship and prayer, and in what manner he himself performed those solemn religious duties. The very act of prayer indeed implies an acknowledgment of inferiority to the being adored; but though Trinitarians affirm that such devotion was paid by Jesus only in his human capacity, his form of prayer ought still to be sufficient to guide human creatures as to the Being to whom their prayers should be addressed. Let us examine, therefore, whether Jesus in his acknowledged human capacity ever offered worship or prayer to what Trinitarians term the second or third person of the Godhead, or once directed his followers to worship or pray to either of them. But so far from finding a single direction of the kind, we observe on the contrary, that Jesus strictly enjoins us to worship the

Digitized by Google

Father alone in that form of prayer which he offered for our guidance. *Matthew*, ch. vi. ver. 9: "After this manner therefore pray ye, *Our Father* which art in heaven," &c. "Pray to *thy Father* which is in secret: and *thy Father*, which seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly." In the same way, when the Saviour himself prays, he addresses the Father alone. *Matthew*, ch. xvix. ver. 53: "Thinkest thou," says Jesus to Peter, "that I cannot now *pray to my Father?*" *John*, ch. xvi. ver. 26: "I will *pray the Father* for you." *Luke*, ch. xxii. ver. 41, 42: "And he (the Saviour) was withdrawn from them about a stone's cast, and kneeled down, and prayed, saying, *Father*, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me." *Mark*, ch. xiv. vers. 35, 36; "And fell on the ground, and prayed, that if it were possible the hour might pass from him. And he said, *Abba, Father*, all things are possible unto thee." *Luke*, ch. vi. ver. 12: "He went out unto a mountain to pray, and continued all night *in prayer* to *God*." *Luke*, ch. x. ver. 21: "In that hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit, and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth." *John*, ch. xi. ver. 41: "And esus lifted up his eyes, and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me." *Matthew*, ch. xxvii. ver. 46: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" *John*, ch. iv. ver. 22: "Ye worship ye know not what; we know what we worship." No creed drawn up by men, nor opinion entertained by any sect, can by an unbiassed searcher after the

Digitized by Google

true doctrines of Christianity, be suffered to set aside the express authority and constant example of the gracious author of this religion.

The last position is, that Jesus associated his own name with that of God in the rite of baptism, intended to remain in force to the end of the world, and ordained by the passage, *Matthew*, ch. xxviii. ver. 19, " Go ye and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." A profession of belief in God is unquestionably common to all the religions supposed to have been founded upon the authority of the Old Testament; but each is distinguished from the other by a public profession of faith in their respective founders, expressing such a profession in a language that may clearly exhibit the inferior nature of those founders to the Divine Being, of whom they declare themselves the messengers. This system has been carried on from the first, and was no doubt intended to serve as a perpetual distinguishing mark of faith. The Jews claim that they have revelation, rendering a belief not in God alone, but in Moses also, incumbent upon them. *Exodus*, ch. xiv. ver. 31 : " The people feared the Lord, and believed the Lord, and his servant Moses." But the term " his servant Moses," in this passage, suffices to prove the subordination of Moses, though declared, equally with God, to be an object of their belief. In like manner, Mohummudans, in the first acknowledgment of that system of religion, are directed to profess

Digitized by Google

faith in God, and also in Mohummud, his messenger, in the following form: "There is no God except the true God, Mohummud is his messenger." The term "his messenger" removes every doubt of Mohummud's identity or equality with God; so the epithet "Son" found in the passage, "Baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son," &c. ought to be understood and admitted by every one as expressing the created nature of Christ, though the most highly exalted among all creatures. If baptism were administered to one embracing Christianity in the name of the Father and the Holy Ghost, he would thereby no more become enrolled as a Christian, than as a Jew or as a Mohummudan; for both of them, in common with Christians, would readily submit to be baptized in the name of God and his prevailing influence over the universe. But as Christianity requires peculiarly a faith in Jesus, as the promised Messiah, the gracious Saviour enjoins baptism in the name of *the Son* also, so as to distinguish his happy followers from the Jews and the rest of the people. A mere association of names in divine commandments therefore never can be considered as tending to prove identity or equality between the subjects of those names:—such junction of names is found frequently in the Sacred Writings without establishing unity among the persons whom those names imply.

The Editor quotes the following passage: *Matthew,* ch. xxviii. ver. 18: "All power in heaven

Digitized by Google

and earth is delivered unto me," recommending it as a sure proof of the deity of Jesus. I regret very much that the force of the expression "is delivered unto me," found in this passage, should have escaped the discerning notice of the Reverend Editor. Does not the term "delivered" show evidently an entire dependence of Jesus upon the Being who has committed to him such power? Is it consistent with the nature of an omnipotent God to exercise power delivered to him by another being, or to confess that the power he possesses has been received by him from another?

As to the question of the Editor, "Did Mohummud, arrogant as he was, ever make such a declaration as Jesus did, namely, that 'I am with you always even to the end of the world?'" I will not renew the subject, as it has been already discussed in examining the first position. I only entreat the attention of the editor to the following assertions of Mohummud, known to almost all Moossulmans who have the least knowledge of their own religion: "Truly the great and glorious God raised me as *mercy* and *guidance* to *worlds*." "I *was the first* of all Prophets in creation, and the last in appearance." "I was a Prophet when Adam was in earth and water." "I am the Lord of those that were sent God. This is no boast to me." "My shadow is on the head only of my followers." "He who has seen me, has seen God." "He who has obeyed me, has obeyed

Digitized by Google

God : and he who has sinned against me, has sinned against God."

It is however fortunate for Moosulmans, that from want of familiarity and intimate connexion between the primitive Mohummudans and their contemporary heathens, the doctrines of Monotheism taught by Mohummud, and entertained by his followers, have not been corrupted by polytheistical notions of Pagans, nor have heathen modes of worship or festivals been introduced among Moosulmans of Arabia and Turkey as a part of their religion. Besides, metaphorical expressions having been very common among Oriental nations, Mohummudans could not fail to understand them in their proper sense, although these expressions may throw great difficulty in the way of a European Commentator, even of profound learning.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER IV.

Inquiry into the Doctrine of the Atonement.

ALL the texts collected by the Reverend Editor in his review, from the authority of the divine Teacher, in favour of the second important doctrine of the cross, implying the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus as an atonement for the sins of mankind, are as follow: "I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever." His giving his "flesh for the life of the world." "I lay down my life for my sheep." "The Son of man is come to give his life a ransom for many." Is any one of these passages, I would ask, in the shape of an explicit commandment, or are they more than a mere statement of facts, requiring figurative interpretation? For it is obvious that an attempt to take them in their direct sense, especially the first, ("I am the living bread;—if any man eat of this," &c.) would amount to gross absurdity. Do they reasonably convey any thing more than the idea, that Jesus was invested with a divine commission to deliver instructions leading to eternal beatitude, which whosoever should receive should live for ever? And that the Saviour, foreseeing that the imparting of those instructions would, by exci-

Digitized by Google

ting the anger and enmity of the superstitious Jews, cause his life to be destroyed, yet hesitated not to persevere in their promulgation; as if a king, who hazards his life to procure freedom and peace for his subjects, were to address himself to them, saying, "I lay down my life for you." This interpretation is fully confirmed by the following passages. *Luke*, ch. iv. ver. 43: "And he said unto them, I must preach the kingdom of God to other cities also; *for therefore am I sent.*" Ch. ii. vers. 47—49: "And all that heard him were astonished at his understanding and answers. And when they (his parents) saw him, they were amazed: and his mother said unto him, Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? Behold, thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing. And he said unto them, How is it that ye sought me? wist ye not that *I must be about my Father's business?*" Wherein Jesus declares, that the sole object of his mission was to preach and impart divine instructions. Again, after having instructed his disciples in all the divine law and will, as appears from the following text, "For I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me," (*John*, ch. xvii. ver. 8,) Jesus in his communion with God manifests that he had completed the object of his mission by imparting divine commandments to mankind. "I have glorified thee on the earth, *I have finish-*

Digitized by Google

ed the work which thou gavest me to do." Had his death on the cross been the work, or part of the work, for the performance of which Jesus was sent into this world, he as the founder of truth would not have declared himself to have finished that work prior to his death.

That Jesus should ride on a colt, should receive an offer of vinegar to drink, and should be wounded with a spear after he had delivered up the ghost, as well as his death on the cross, were events prophesied in the Old Testament, and consequently these were fulfilled by Jesus. Vide *Luke*, ch. xxiv. vers. 26 and 27 : "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory ? And beginning at Moses and all the Prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself." But we are unhappily at a loss to discover any other design in each of these events, which happened to Jesus before his ascent to heaven. I am therefore sorry that I must plead my inability to make a satisfactory reply to the question of the Editor, "Had ever Jesus transgressed his heavenly Father's will, that he underwent such afflictions." I can only say, that we find in the Scriptures that several other Prophets in common with Jesus suffered great afflictions, and some even death, as predicted. But I know not whether those afflictions were the consequences of the sins committed by them or by their parents, or whether these distresses were experienced by them through some divine purpose unknown to us ; as some scriptural

Digitized by Google

authorities show beyond doubt, that man may be made liable to sufferings for some secret divine purpose, without his or his parents having perpetrated any remarkable crime. (*John*, ch. ix. ver. 3: "Jesus answered, Neither hath this man sinned nor his parents; but that the works of God should be made manifest in him.") The latter alternative (namely, that the righteous Prophets suffered afflictions and even death for some divine purpose, known thoroughly to God alone) seems more consistent with the contents of the sacred writings, such as follow: *Mark*, ch. xiii. vers. 1—9: "And he began to speak unto them by parables. A certain man planted a vineyard, and set a hedge about it, and digged a place for the wine fat, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country. And at the season he sent to the husbandmen a servant, that he might receive from the husbandmen of the fruit of the vineyard. And they caught him, and beat him, and sent him away empty. And again he sent unto them another servant; and at him they cast stones, and wounded him in the head, and sent him away shamefully handled. And again he sent another; and him they killed, and many others; beating some, and killing some. Having yet therefore one son, his well-beloved, he sent him also last unto them, saying, They will reverence my son. But these husbandmen said among themselves, This is the heir; come let us kill him, and the inheritance shall be ours. And they took him, and killed him, and cast him out of

Digitized by Google

the vineyard. What shall therefore the lord of the vineyard do? He will come and destroy the husbandmen, and will give the vineyard unto others." *John*, ch. xv. vers. 21, 22: "But all these things will they do unto you for my name's sake, because they know not him that sent me. If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin: but now they have no cloke for their sin." This parable and these passages give countenance to the idea, that God suffered his Prophets, and Jesus his beloved Son, to be cruelly treated and slain by the Jews, for the purpose of taking away every excuse that they might offer for their guilt.

In explaining the objects of Jesus's death on the cross, the Editor confidently assumes, that "If we view Jesus Christ as atoning for the sins of men, we have every thing perfectly in character: he became incarnate to accomplish that which could have been effected by neither men nor angels." I should therefore wish to know whether Jesus, whom the Editor represents as God incarnate, suffered death and pain for the sins of men in his divine nature, or in his human capacity? The former must be highly inconsistent with the nature of God, which, we are persuaded to believe by reason and tradition, is above being rendered liable to death or pain; since the difference we draw between God, and the objects that are not God, is, that one cannot be subjected to death or termination, and the other is finite and liable to mortality. That the effects of Christ's appearance on earth,

Digitized by Google

whether with respect to the salvation or condemnation of mankind, were finite, and therefore suitable to the nature of a finite being to accomplish, is evident from the fact, that to the present time millions of human beings are daily passing through the world, whom the doctrines he taught have never reached, and who of course must be considered as excluded from the benefit of his having died for the remission of their sins. The latter, namely, that Jesus suffered death and pain in his human capacity as an atonement for the offences of others, seems totally inconsistent with the justice ascribed to God, and even at variance with those principles of equity required of men; for it would be a piece of gross iniquity to afflict one innocent being, who had all the human feelings, and who had never transgressed the will of God, with the death of the cross, for the crimes committed by others, especially when he declares such great aversion to it, as is manifest from the following passages. *Matthew*, ch. xxvi. vers. 37, 39, 42 and 43: "And he took with him Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, and began to be sorrowful and very heavy. And prayed, saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup [meaning death] pass from me: nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt. He went away again the second time, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if this cup may not pass away from me, except I drink it, thy will be done." *Mark*, ch. xiv. ver. 36: "And he said, Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee;

Digitized by Google

take away this cup from me: nevertheless, not what I will, but what thou wilt." *Luke*, ch. xxii. vers. 42 and 44: "Saying, Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me; nevertheless, not my will, but thine be done. And being in an agony he prayed more earnestly; and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood, falling down to the ground." *John*, ch. xii. ver. 27: "Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour: but for this cause came I unto this hour." Do not these passages evidently show, that Jesus in his human capacity (according to the Trinitarian phrase) felt averse to death and pain, and that he earnestly prayed that he might not be subjected to it? Jesus, however, knowing that the will of the Father rendered such death unavoidable, yielded to it as predicted. *John*, ch. xi. vers. 17 and 18: "Therefore doth my Father *love me*, because *I lay down my life* that I might take it again: no *man* taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself; I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it *again*: this *commandment have I received of my Father*." *Matthew*, ch. xxvi. vers. 53 and 54: "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels? But how then shall the Scripture be fulfilled, that thus it must be?" The iniquity of one's being sentenced to death as an atonement for the fault committed by another, is so palpable, that although in many countries the human race

Digitized by Google

think themselves justified in detaining the persons of those men who, voluntarily making themselves responsible for the debt or the persons of others, fail to fulfil their engagements; nevertheless, every just man among them would shudder at the idea of one's being put to death for a crime committed by another, even if the innocent man should willingly offer his life in behalf of that other.

In endeavouring to prove Jesus's atonement for sin by his death, the Reverend Editor urges, "Is he called the Saviour of men, because he gave them moral precepts, by obeying which they might obtain the Divine favour, with the enjoyment of heaven as their just desert? or, because he died in their stead, to atone for their sins and procure for them every blessing, &c.? If Jesus be termed a Saviour merely because he instructed men, he has this honour in common with Moses, and Elijah, and John the Baptist, neither of whom however assumed the title of Saviour." We find the title "Saviour" applied frequently in the divine writings to those persons who had been endued with the power of saving people, either by inculcating doctrines, or affording protection to them, although none of them atoned for the sins of mankind by their death. *Obadiah*, ver. 21: "And *saviours* shall come up on mount Zion to judge the mount of Esau; and the kingdom shall be the Lord's." *Nehemiah*, ch. ix. ver. 27: "And according to thy manifold mercies thou gavest them *saviours*, who saved them out of the

Digitized by Google

hand of their enemies." 2 *Kings*, ch. xiii. ver. 5: "The Lord gave Israel a *saviour*, so that they went out from under the hand of the Syrians." How could, therefore, the Editor, a diligent student of the Bible, lay such a stress upon the application of the term "Saviour" to Jesus, as to adduce it as a proof of the doctrine of atonement; especially when Jesus himself declares frequently, that he saved the people solely through the inculcation of the word of God? *John*, ch. xv. ver. 3: "Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you." Ch. v. ver. 24: "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life." Ch. vi. ver. 63: "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life:"—wherein Jesus represents himself as a Saviour, or a distributer of eternal life, in his capacity of divine teacher.

Jesus is of course justly termed and esteemed a Saviour, for having instructed men in the Divine will and law, never before so fully revealed. Would it degrade Jesus to revere him as a Divine Teacher, because Moses and the Prophets before him delivered to the people divine instructions? Or would it depreciate the dignity of Jesus, to believe that he, in common with several other prophets, underwent afflictions and death? Such an idea is indeed unscriptural, for God represents the Christ as a Prophet equal to Moses, *Deut.* ch. xviii. ver. 18. Jesus declares himself to have come to fulfil the law taught by Moses, (*Matthew*,

Digitized by Google

ch. v ver. 7,) "Think not that I am come to destroy the Law and the Prophets, I am not come to destroy but to fulfil ;" and strictly commands his disciples and the people at large to obey whatever Moses had taught. Ch. xxiii. vers. 2, 3: "Saying, the Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not."

I am sorry that I cannot, without offending my conscience, agree with the Reverend Editor in the opinion, that "If Jesus be esteemed merely a teacher, the greater degree of honour must be given to Moses, for it was in reality his law that Jesus explained and established."

It is true that Moses began to erect the everlasting edifice of true religion, consisting of a knowledge of the unity of God, and obedience to his will and commandments; but Jesus of Nazareth has completed the structure, and rendered his law perfect. To convince the Editor of this fact, I beg to call his attention to the following instances, found even in a single chapter, as exhibiting the perfection to which Jesus brought the Law given by Moses and other Prophets. *Matthew*, ch. v. vers. 21, 22: "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment; but I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause, shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother,

Digitized by Google

Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire." Vers. 27, 28: "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery: but I say unto you, that whomsoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery." Vers. 31, 32: "It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement: but I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery." Verses 38, 39: "Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth; but I say unto you, that ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." Vers. 43—45: "Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy: but I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." Now I hope I may be justified in expressing my belief, (though it varies from the declaration made by the Editor,) that no *greater* honour can be justly given to any teacher of the will of God, than what is due to the *author* of the doctrines just quoted, which, with a power no less

Digitized by Google

than standing miracles could produce, carry with them proofs of their divine origin to the conviction of the high and low, the learned and unlearned.

The Editor, in page 101,* lays much stress on circumstances, the very minuteness of which, he thinks, "serves to enhance their value as testimonies." He alludes to the epithet "Lamb of God" having been twice applied to Jesus by John the Baptist, two of whose disciples were thereby induced to become followers of Jesus. This is considered by the Editor as implying an admission on the part of Christ, that as a lamb, particularly the Paschal Lamb, was used in sacrifice as an atonement for sins, he also came into the world to sacrifice his life as an atonement for sin. We find, however, the term "lamb," as well as "sheep," applied in other places, where no allusion to the sacrificial lamb can be well imagined, and from which we infer that these were epithets generallly applied to innocence subjected to persecution; a meaning which sufficiently accords with the use of the word lamb in the instance in question. We have those terms applied by Jesus to his disciples in *John*, ch. xxi. vers. 15—17, where he commands Simon Peter "to feed his lambs," "to feed his sheep;" and in ch. x. vers. 26, 27, "Ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep." —"My sheep hear my voice." Now many of the apostles suffered death in consequence of their

* [London edition, page 37.]

Digitized by Google

endeavours to withdraw men from sin: but the Editor will not thence, I presume, maintain, though it follow from his argument, that the term "lamb" was applied to them, to show that by their death, they also atoned for the sins of mankind. The Reverend Editor might have spared the arguments he has adduced to prove, that Jesus was sent into this world as the long-expected Messiah, intended to suffer death and difficulties like other prophets who went before him; as the Editor may find in the compilation in question, as well as in its defence, Jesus of Nazareth represented as "The Son of God," a term synonymous with that of Messiah, the highest of all the prophets; and his life declares him to have been, as represented in the Scriptures, pure as light, innocent as a lamb, necessary for eternal life as bread for a temporal one, and great as the angels of God, or rather greater than they. He also might have omitted to quote such authority as shows, that Christ, being a mediator between God and men, "declared that whatsoever they (his apostles) shall ask in his name, the Father will give them;" for the Compiler, in his defence of the Precepts of Jesus, repeatedly acknowledged Christ as the Redeemer, Mediator, and Intercessor with God, in behalf of his followers. But such intercession does not, I presume, tend to a proof of the deity or the atonement of Jesus, as interpreted by the Editor; for God is represented in the sacred books to have often shown mercy to mankind for righteous men's sakes; how much more then

Digitized by Google

would he naturally manifest his favour towards those who might petition him in the name of one, whom he anointed and exalted over all creatures and prophets? *Genesis*, ch. xxx. ver. 27: "I have learned by experience, that the Lord hath blessed me for thy sake." *Jeremiah*, ch. xxvii. ver. 18: "But if they be prophets, and if the word of the Lord be with them, let them now make intercession to the Lord of hosts." Moreover, we find angels declared to have been endued with the power of pardoning and redeeming men on various occasions. *Genesis*, ch. xlviii. ver. 16: "The Angels which redeemeth me from evil, bless the lads!" *Exodus*, ch. xxii. vers. 20, 21: "Behold, I send an Angel before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not, for he will not pardon your transgressions: for my name is in him."

With regard to this doctrine, I have carefully noticed every argument advanced by the Editor, from the authority of Jesus himself, in its support; and have adduced such arguments as may be used by those that reject that doctrine, and which they rest on the authority of the same Divine Teacher: leaving the decision of the subject to the discreet judgment of the public, but declining to deliver any opinion, as an individual, as to the merits thereof.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER V.

On the Doctrines and Miraculous Narrations of the New Testament.

I REGRET that the Editor should have accused the Compiler of having charged "on the dogmas or doctrines of Christianity those wars and that bloodshed which have occurred between nations merely termed Christians." The Compiler, in his defence of the Precepts of Jesus, has ascribed such disputes and contentions not to any thing contained in the Scriptures, but to the different interpretations of dogmas which he esteemed not essential for salvation. In order to convince the Editor of the accuracy of my assertion, I entreat his attention to page 18, line 22, and page 22, line 24, of my defence of the compiled Precepts, under the designation of "An Appeal to the Christian Public."*

The Editor observes, that "wars and bloodshed existed before the promulgation of Christianity in the world; neither Christianity, therefore, nor its dogmas, created the causes of wars and bloodshed. They existed in the human mind long before its doctrines were published; and that quarrels and feuds between the Arians and the Orthodox in the fourth and fifth centuries were lit-

* [See above, p. 117, line 26, and p. 121, lines 1—4.]

Digitized by Google

tle more than struggles for power and wealth." Although human frailty and want of perfection in men are in fact esteemed as the first and original causes of their improper conduct and wicked deeds, yet in the ordinary acceptation of the term "cause," good or evil acts are invariably attributed to their immediate motives, ascertained form circumstantial evidence ; and these acts are consequently held to entitle their respective agents to praise or reproach.—But as the motives of actions and the secrets of the human heart are in truth known to God alone, it is indeed beyond my power to establish in a satisfactory manner, that the majority of the primitive Arians and Trinitarians were excited by their mistaken religious zeal to slay each other, and not by a desire of power and worldly advancement. I would appeal, however, to the Editor himself, whether it would not be indeed very illiberal to suppose, that almost all the Christian world should for a period of two hundred years have been weak or wicked enough to engage wilfully in causing the blood of each other to be shed under the cloak of religion, and merely for worldly motives. But as this must be a matter of opinion, I beg to show that which has been entertained on the subject by one of the highest authorities against the Trinitarians who have written on the history of Christianity. I allude to Dr. Moshiem, whose words I here give, and I entreat my readers to draw their own inferences from them.

Digitized by Google

Volume 1. page 419 : "After the death of Constantine the Great, one of his sons, Constantius, who in the division of the empire became ruler of the East, was warmly attached to the Arian party, whose principles were also zealously adopted by the Empress, and indeed by the whole court. On the other hand, Constantine and Constans, Emperors of the West, maintained the decrees of the Council of Nice throughout all the provinces between the two contending parties.—Hence arose endless animosities and seditions, treacherous plots, and open acts of injustice and violence between the two contending parties; Council was assembled against Council, and their jarring and contradictory decrees spread perplexity and confusion throughout the Christian world." Page 420: "His (Gratian's) zeal for their interest, though fervent and active, was surpassed by that of his successor Theodosius the Great, who raised the secular arm against the Arians with a terrible degree of violence, drove them from their churches, and enacted laws, whose severity exposed them to the greatest calamities." It is difficult to conceive what other motives than those of mistaken zeal for a particular doctrine could have influenced the mind of an Emperor like Theodosius to such acts of cruelty and violence: but however that may be, it is obvious that if such a mode of interpreting conduct be adopted, it is difficult to say where we are to stop. The devotion even of the Apostles and Martyrs of Christianity, may be

Digitized by Google

attributed to a pursuit after power over the minds and respect in the eyes of men, and all distinction of good and evil character be considered as futile and without foundation. With respect to the final success of the Trinitarian party, it appears to me the event naturally to have been expected. For, to the people of those ages, doctrines that resembled the polytheistical belief that till then prevailed, must have been more acceptable than those which were diametrically opposed to such notions. The idea of a God in human form was easy and familiar: Emperors and Empresses had altars raised to them even during their lives, and after death were enrolled as divinities. Perhaps too, something may justly be attributed to a certain degree of pride and satisfaction in the idea, that the religion they had begun to profess was dictated immediately by the Deity himself, rather than by any subordinate agency. There had not been among the heathens any class of mankind to whom they were accustomed to look up with that devotion familiarly entertained by the Jews towards Moses and their Prophets, and they were consequently ready to elevate to a God any being who rose in their estimation above the level of mankind.

The violence and outrages which Roman Catholics and Protestants have experienced from each other, were not, of course, as observed by the Reverend Editor, owing in their origin to the adoption of different interpretations respecting the deity of Christ or of the Holy Ghost;

Digitized by Google

but they were the immediate consequences of the different sentiments they have held with respect to the doctrine of an exclusive power of granting absolution, and leading to eternal life, being vested in St. Peter and his successors. What great mischief has however een produced, and how many lives have from time to time been destroyed, from the difference of sentiments held by the parties with regard to this doctrine, which even the Editor himself does not deem an essential point of religion!

The Editor in p. 114* argues, as a proof of the importance of the doctrines of the Gospel, that Christ taught them, fully foreseeing that they would be the subject of dispute ; and quotes his saying, that he came not to send peace on earth, but a sword. The whole of the 10th chap. of Matthew, from which the Editor quotes the passage here alluded to, consists of the instructions delivered by Jesus to the twelve Apostles, when he sent them forth to preach the kingdom of heaven to the lost sheep of the house of Israel; but has no allusion, that I can perceive, to eternal dissentions amongst those who were already or might afterwards become Christians. That Jesus foresaw, as one of the primary effects of preaching his Gospel, that great dissentions would arise—that he was aware that the great question of confessing him to be the Messiah or not, would be as a sword between a man and his father, the daughter and her mother, and the daughter-in-law

* (London Edition, p. 56.)

Digitized by Google

and her mother-in-law, is evident. But this seems to me by no means to prove that Jesus, as supposed by the Editor, "longed or almost longed" to see a fire kindled in the earth respecting doctrines not essential to the salvation of mankind. Nor would it have been any reason for suppressing the most trivial of his sayings, that priestcraft working on the ignorance and superstition, the bigotry or intolerance of mankind, should have wrested his words to evil purposes.—As observed by the Editor himself, the mischief lay originally in human nature, not in any part of the doctrines of Christ; but as those dissentions are now perpetuated principally by education, a cause essentially distinct from their origin, the case is entirely altered The corruption of the human heart cannot be totally removed; but the evil effects that spring from human institutions may be avoided, when their real sources are known. After the secret and immediate causes of persecution have passed away, the differences of opinion which have been the declared grounds of hostility are handed down by the teachers of different sects; and, as already repeatedly avowed, it was with the view of evading, not those questions concerning which Jesus spoke and which distinguish his followers from all others, but those which have from time to time been seized upon to excite enmities still existing amongst fellow-christians, that the Compiler confined himself to those Precepts, concerning which all mankind must be of one accord.

As to the question of the Editor, "It can scarcely

Digitized by Google

be unknown to the Compiler, that the very being of a God has been for numerous ages the subject of dispute among the most learned of his own country; does he account this a sufficient reason for suppressing this doctrine? We know that he does not. Why then should he omit the doctrines of Christ and his Apostles, because men have made them the subject of dispute?" For a direct answer to this question, I beg to refer the Reverend Editor to the Appeal of the Compiler, page 27, wherein he will find that he assigns not one, but two circumstances, as concurring to form the motive of his having omitted certain doctrines of Christianity in his selection.—1st, that they are the subjects of disputes and contention,—2ndly, that they are not essential to religion.* It is therefore obvious, that the analogy between the omission of certain dogmas, and that of the being of a God, has been unfairly drawn by the Editor. Admitting that the doctrines of Christianity and the existence of a God are equally liable to disputes, it should be recollected that the former are, in the estimation of the Compiler, not essential to religion; while the latter is acknowledged by him, in common with the professors of every faith, to be the foundation of all religion, as distinctly stated in his Introduction to the select Precepts of Jesus. Every system of religion adopts the idea of a God, and avows this as its fundamental principle, though they differ from one another in representing

* [See above, p. 125.]

Digitized by Google

the nature and attributes of the Deity. The Compiler therefore could have no motive for suppressing the doctrines of the being of a God, though disputed by a few pretended literary men ; and he has consequently never hesitated to inculcate with all his power the idea of one God to the learned and unlearned of his own country, taking care at the same time as much as possible not to enter into particulars as to the real nature, essence, attributes, person, or substance of the Godhead, those being points above his comprehension, and liable to interminable disputes. The Reverend Editor thus expresses his surprise at the conduct of the Compiler, in omitting in his selection the miraculous relations of the Gospel :—" We cannot but wonder that his miracles should not have found greater favour in the eyes of the Compiler of this selection, while the amazing weight which Jesus himself attached to them could scarcely have escaped his notice :" and in order to prove the importance of the miracles ascribed to Jesus, the Editor quotes three instances, in the first of which Jesus referred John the Baptist to his wonderful miracles ; in the second, he called the attention of unbelieving Jews to his miraculous works as a proof of his divine mission ; in the third, he recommends Philip the Apostle to the evidence of his miracles. But after a slight attention to the circumstances in which those appeals were made, it appears clearly, that in these and other instances Jesus referred to his miracles those persons

Digitized by Google

only who either *scrupled to believe*, or doubted him as the promised Messiah, or required of him some sign to confirm their faith. Vide *Matthew*, ch. xi. vers. 2—4: "When John had heard in the prison the works of Christ, he sent two of his disciples, and said unto him, Art thou he that should come, or do we *look for another?* Jesus answered and said unto them, Go and show John those things which ye do hear and see." *John*, ch. x. vers. 37 and 38, Jesus says to those Jews who accused him of blasphemy, "If I do not the works of my Father believe me not. But *if I do*, though ye believe not me, *believe the works.*" In reply to the request of Philip, who, being discontented with the doctrines Jesus inculcated, said, "Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us;" Jesus answered and said, "Believe me, that I am in the Father and the Father in me, *or else* believe me for the very works' sake." (*John*, ch. xiv. ver. 11,) Jesus even speaks in terms of reproach of those that seek for miracles for their conviction as to his divine mission. *Matthew*, ch. xii. ver. 39: "But he answered and said unto them, An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign." Moreover, he blesses them who, without having recourse to the proofs of miracles, profess their belief on him. *John*, ch. xx. ver. 29: "Jesus said unto him, Thomas, because thou hast seen me thou hast believed: *blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.*"

Under these circumstances, and from the expe-

Digitized by Google

rience that nothing but the sublimity of the Precepts of Jesus had at first drawn the attention of the Compiler himself towards Christianity, and excited his veneration for the author of this religion, without aid from miraculous relations, he omitted in his compilation the mention of the miracles performed by Jesus, without meaning to express doubts of their authenticity, or intending to slight them by such an omission.

I regret therefore, that the Editor should have suffered any part of his valuable time to be spent in advancing several arguments, in the concluding part of his Review, to establish the truth of the miraculous statements of the New Testament. But as this discussion applies to the evidence of miracles generally, it may be worth considering. Arguments adduced by the Editor amount to this: "If all social, political, mercantile, and judicial transactions be allowed to rest upon testimony; why should not the validity of Christian miracles be concluded from the testimony of the Apostles and others, and be relied upon by all the nations of the world?" The Editor must be well aware, that the enemies to revelation draw a line of distinction on the subject of proofs by testimony, between the current events of nature familiar to the senses of mankind, and within the scope of human exertions; and extraordinary facts beyond the limits of common experience, and ascribed to a direct interposition of Divine power suspending the usual course of nature. If all assertions were to

Digitized by Google

be indiscriminately admitted as facts, merely because they are testified by numbers, how can we dispute the truth of those miracles which are said to have been performed by persons esteemed holy amongst natives of this country ? The Compiler has never placed the miracles related in the New Testament on a footing with the extravagant tales of his countrymen, but distinctly expressed his persuasion that they (Christian miracles) would be apt at best to carry little weight with those whose imaginations had been accustomed to dwell on narrations much more wonderful, and supported by testimony which they have been taught to regard with a reverence that they cannot be expected all at once to bestow on the Apostles. See Introduction to the Precepts, and Appeal, p. 17.* The very same line of argument, indeed, pursued by the Editor, would equally avail the Hindoos. Have they not accounts and records handed down to them relating to the wonderful miracles stated to have been performed by their saints, such as Ugustyu, Vushistu, and Gotum ; and their gods incarnate, such as Ram, Krishnu, and Nursingh ; in presence of their cotemporary friends and enemies, the wise and the ignorant, the select and the multitude ?—Could not the Hindoos quote in support of their narrated miracles, authorities from the histories of their most inveterate enemies the Jeins, who join the Hindoos entirely in acknow-

* [Present edition, page 115.]

Digitized by Google

ledging the truth and credibility of their miraculous accounts? The only difference which subsists between these two parties on this subject is, that the Hindoos consider the power of performing miracles given to their gods and saints by the Supreme Deity, and the Jeins declare that they performed all those astonishing works by *Asooree Shukti*, or by demoniac power. Moossulmans, on the other hand, can produce records written and testified by cotemporaries of Mohummud, both friends and enemies, who are represented as eye-witnesses of the miracles ascribed to him; such as his dividing the moon into two parts, and walking in sunshine without casting a shadow. They can assert, too, that several of those witnesses suffered the greatest calamities, and some even death, in defence of that religion; some before the attempts of Mohummud at conquest, others after his commencing such attempts, and others after his death. On mature consideration of all those circumstances, the Compiler hopes he may be allowed to remain still of opinion, that the miraculous relations found in the divine writings would be apt at best to carry little weight with them, when imparted to the Hindoos at large, in the present state of their minds: but as no other religion can produce any thing that may stand in competition with the Precepts of Jesus, much less that can be pretended to be superior to them, the Compiler deemed it incumbent upon him to introduce these among his countrymen as a Guide to Peace and Happiness.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER VI.

On the Impersonality of the Holy Spirit. Miscellaneous Remarks.

I WILL now inquire into the justness of the conclusion drawn by the Editor, in his attempt to prove the Deity of the Holy Ghost, from the circumstance of his name being associated with that of the Father in the rite of Baptism. This subject is incidentally brought forward in the course of the arguments he has adduced respecting the nature of Jesus, where he observes, "It is needless to add that this testimony of Jesus (the associating of his own name and that of the Holy Ghost with the name of the Father) is equally decisive respecting the Deity of the Holy Ghost." I have hitherto omitted to notice this question among other matters in review, reserving it for the express purpose of a distinct and separate examination. It seems to me. in the first place. rather singular, that the Reverend Editor, after having filled up many pages with numerous arguments in his endeavour to establish the Godhead of Jesus, should have noticed in so short and abrupt a manner, the question of the Deity of the Holy Ghost, although the Editor equally esteems them both as distinct persons of the Deity. I wonder, in the

Digitized by Google

next place, how the learned Editor could suppose a mere association of names in a rite to be sufficient to prove the identity of their subjects. I am indeed sorry I cannot, without overlooking a great many scriptural authorities, and defying reason totally, join the Editor in the opinion, that the association of the name of the Holy Spirit with that of the Father of the Universe, in the rite of Baptism, is "decisive" of, or even allusive to, the separate personality of the Spirit.

2 *Chronicles*, ch. xx. ver. 20: "Jehoshaphat stood and said, "Hear me, O Judah, and ye inhabitants of Jerusalem; believe in the Lord your God, so shall ye be established; believe his prophets, so shall ye prosper;" wherein the name of the Prophets of God is associated with that of the Deity himself in the profession of belief, which is considered by Christians of all denominations more essential than an external symbol of Christianity. Again, in *Jeremiah*, ch. xxx. ver. 9, "But they shall serve the Lord their God, and David their King, whom I will raise up unto them," the Lord joins his name with that of David in the act of religious service, which is in its strictest sense esteemed due to God alone. Would it not therefore be unscriptural to make an attempt to prove the deity of the Prophets, or David, under the plea that their names are associated with that of God in religious observances? But we must do so, were we to follow the process of reasoning adopted by the Reverend Editor. The kind of evidence on which the Editor relies in this

Digitized by Google

instance, would besides suit admirably the purposes of those who might seek in the sacred Scriptures, grounds for justifying idolatry. Fire worshippers, for instance, insisting on the literal sense of the words, might refer to that text in the 3d chapter of Matthew, repeated in *Luke*, ch. iii. ver. 16, in which it is announced, that Jesus Christ will baptise with the Holy Ghost and with fire. If the association in the rite of Baptism of the names of the Son and the Holy Ghost, with that of the Father, proves their divinity; it is clear, that fire also being associated with the Holy Ghost in the same rite, must likewise be considered as a part of the Godhead.

God is invariably represented in revelation as the main object of belief, receiving worship and prayers that proceed from the heart through the first-born of every creature, the Messiah, ("No man cometh unto the Father but by me," *John*, ch. xiv. ver. 6,) and leading such as worship him in spirit to righteous conduct, and ultimately to salvation, through his guiding influence, which is called the Holy Spirit, ("when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth," *John*, ch. xvi. ver. 13.) There is therefore a moral obligation on those who avow the truth of such revelation to profess their belief in God as the sole object of worship; and in the Son, through whom they, as Christians, should offer divine homage; and also in the holy influence of God, from which they should expect direction in the path of righteous-

Digitized by Google

ness, as the consequence of their sincere prayer and supplication. For the same reason also in publicly adopting this religion, it is proper that those who receive it should be baptised in the name of the Father, who is the object of worship: of the Son, who is the mediator; and of that influence by which spiritual blessings are conveyed to mankind, designated in the Scriptures as the Comforter, Spirit of truth, or Holy Spirit. As God is declared through his Holy Spirit to have led to righteousness such as sought heartily his will, so he is equally represented to have through his wrath afflicted rebels against his authority, and to have prospered through his infinite mercy those who manifested obedience to him; as appears from the following passages. 2 *Kings*, ch. xxiv. ver. 20: "For through the anger of the Lord it came to pass in Jerusalem, until he had cast them out from his presence." *Psalm* xc. ver. 7: "For we are consumed by thine anger, and by thy wrath are we troubled." *Psalm* xxi. ver. 7: "And through the *mercy* of the Most High he shall not be moved." *Psalm* vi. ver. 4: "Return, O Lord, deliver my soul; O save me for thy *mercy's* sake." Nor can we legitimately infer the idea of the self-existence or distinct personality of the Holy Ghost, from such metaphorical language as the following: "The Holy Ghost shall teach you." *Luke*, ch. xii. ver. 12. "The Holy Ghost is come upon you." *Acts*, ch. 1. ver. 8. "The Comforter, who is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send." *John*, ch. xiv. ver. 26. For we find expres-

Digitized by Google

sions of a similar nature applied to other attributes of God, personifying them equally with the Holy Spirit. *Psalm* lvii. ver. 3: "God shall *send* forth his *mercy* and his *truth*." *Ps.* lxxxv. ver. 10: "*Mercy* and *truth* are *met* together." *Ps.* c. ver. 5: "The Lord is good, his *mercy* is *everlasting*." *Ps.* xxxiii. ver. 22: "Let thy *mercy*, O Lord, be upon us." *Ps.* xxxvi. ver. 5: "Thy *mercy*, O Lord, is in the heavens." *Ps.* cviii. ver. 4: "For thy *mercy* is great above the heavens." *Ezekiel*, ch. vii. ver. 3: "I will *send* my *anger* upon thee." 2 *Chronicles*, ch. xxiv. ver. 18: "*Wrath* came upon Judah for this trespass.

Were every attribute ascribed to the Deity which is found personified, to be therefore considered as a distinct personage, it would be difficult to avoid forming a very strange notion of the theology of the Bible. It appears indeed to me impossible to view the Holy Spirit as very God, without coming to ideas respecting the nature of the Deity, little different from some of those most generally and justly condemned as found amongst Polytheists. Take, for instance, *Matthew*, ch i. 11, where it is said, that Mary was found with child of the Holy Ghost. Ver. 20: "That which is conceived in her, is of the Holy Ghost." *Luke*, ch. i. 35: "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee." In interpreting these passages according to the opinion maintained by the Editor, we should necessarily be drawn to the idea

Digitized by Google

that God came upon Mary, and that the child which she bore was in reality begotten of him. Is this idea, I would beg to know, consistent with the perfect nature of the righteous God? Or rather, is not such a notion of the Godhead's having had intercourse with a human female, as horrible as the sentiments entertained by ancient and modern heathens respecting the Deity? On the other hand, if we understand by those passages, merely that the miraculous influence of God came upon Mary, so that, though a virgin, she bore a child, every thing would stand consistent with our belief of the divine power, without shocking our ideas of the purity of the Deity, inculcated alike by reason and revelation. This mode of interpretation is indeed confirmed by the very passage of *Luke* above quoted, "The power of the Highest shall overshadow thee;" plainly and simply declaring, that it was the power of God which gave birth to the child, contrary to the ordinary course of nature. If by the term "Holy Ghost" be meant a third distinct person of the Godhead, equal in power and glory with the Father of all; I am at a loss to know what Trinitarians understand by such expressions as the following: *Matthew*, ch. iii. ver. 11, and *Luke*, ch. iii. ver. 16: "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." *Acts*, ch. x. ver. 38: "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power." *Matthew*, ch. xii. ver. 28: "I cast out devils by the Spirit of God." Ver. 31: "All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blas-

Digitized by Google

phemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men." *Luke*, ch. iv. ver. 1: "And Jesus, being full of the Holy Ghost, returned from Jordan." If the term "Holy Ghost" be synonymous with the third person of the Godhead, and "Christ" with the second person, the foregoing passages may be read as follows: "He, the second person, shall baptise you with the third person of the Godhead, and with fire." "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth, (the second person of the Godhead) with the third person of the Godhead, and with power." "I (the second person of the Godhead) cast out devils by the third person of the Godhead." "All manner of sin and blasphemy, even against the first and second persons of the Godhead, shall be forgiven unto men; but blasphemy against the third person of the Godhead shall not be forgiven unto men." "Jesus, (the second person of the Godhead,) being full of the third person of the Godhead, returned from Jordan." But little reflection is, I should suppose, necessary to enable any one to perceive the inconsistency of such paraphrases as the foregoing, and the reasonableness of adopting the usual mode of scriptural interpretation of the original texts, according to which the foregoing passages may be understood as follows: "He shall baptise you with the spirit of truth and purity." "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with his holy influence and power." "I cast out devils by the influence of God." "All manner of sin and blasphemy even

Digitized by Google

against the Christ, the first-born of every creature, shall be forgiven to men; but blasphemy against the power of God shall not be forgiven unto men." "Jesus, being full of the influence of God, returned from Jordan." Still more dangerous to true religion would it be to interpret, according to the Trinitarian mode, the passages which describe the descent of the Holy Ghost upon Jesus on the occasion of his baptism. *Luke*, ch. iii. ver. 22: "And the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him." For if we believe that Spirit, in the form of a dove, or in any other *bodily shape*, was really the third person, of the Godhead, how can we justly charge with absurdity the Hindoo legends of the Divinity having the form of a fish or of any other animal?

It ought to be remarked, with respect to the text above quoted, denouncing eternal wrath on those who blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, that the occasion on which the term was made use of by Christ, was the accusation of the Jews, that his miracles were the effects of an influence of a nature directly opposite to that of God, namely, the power of Beelzebub, the Prince of Devils. The Jews alleged that he was possessed of an unclean or diabolical spirit. ("Because they said, He hath an unclean spirit." *Mark*, ch. iii. ver. 30. "They said, This fellow doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub, the prince of devils." *Matthew*, ch. xii. ver. 24.) Jesus affirms, that the Spirit which enabled him to do those wonderful works

Digitized by Google

was a holy Spirit; and that whatever language they might hold with respect to himself, blasphemy against that power by which he did those miracles would not be forgiven. "All manner of sins and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in the world to come."

Were the words "all manner of blasphemy," in the passage in question, received as including blasphemy against the Father, the term must be thus understood: "All manner of blasphemy against man and the Father, and even blasphemy against the Son, shall be forgiven; but blasphemy against the Holy Ghost must not be forgiven:" and consequently the interpretation would amount to an admission of the superiority of the Son and the Holy Ghost to the Father, an opinion which no sect of Christians has hitherto formed. In the above-quoted passage, therefore, the exception of the Holy Ghost must exclude blasphemy against the Father, and the whole should be thus interpreted:—All manner of blasphemy against men and angels, even against the first-born of every creature, shall be forgiven; but blasphemy against the power of God, by which Jesus declared himself to have cast out devils, shall not be forgiven. For further illustration I quote here the

Digitized by Google

whole passage of *Matthew*, ch. xii. vers. 24—37: "But when the Pharisees heard it, they said, This fellow doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils. And Jesus knew their thoughts, and said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand. And if Satan cast out Satan, he is divided against himself; how shall then his kingdom stand? And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out? therefore they shall be your judges. But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you. Or else how can one enter into a strong man's house and spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong man? and then he will spoil his house. He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad. Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come. Either make the tree good, and his fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt, and his fruit corrupt: for the tree is known by his fruit. O generation of vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the

Digitized by Google

heart the mouth speaketh. A good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things : and an evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth evil things. But I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment. For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned." *Mark*, ch. iii. vers. 29, 30 : "But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation : because they said, He hath an unclean spirit."

Is it not evident from the above authority of Jesus himself, that the term "Holy Ghost" is synonymous to the prevailing influence of God ? And had not the power by which Jesus performed his miracles the same origin, and was it not of the same nature, as that by which the children of Israel performed theirs ? "If I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out ? therefore they shall be your judges." It may not be without use to notice here, that frequent instances are related in the Scriptures of the influence of the Spirit of God, in leading righteous men to truth, before Jesus had commenced the performance of his divine commission, and even before he had appeared in this world ; in the same manner as it afterwards operated in guiding his true followers to the way of God, subsequent to his ascent to heaven, in consequence of his repeated intercession with the Father.

Digitized by Google

This will fully appear from the following passages, *Luke*, ch. i. ver. 15: "And he (John the Baptist) shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb." Ver. 41: "And it came to pass, that when Elizabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the babe leaped in her womb; and Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost." Ver. 67: "And his (John's) father Zacharias was filled with the Holy Ghost, and prophesied," &c. Ch. ii. vers. 25, 26: "And behold, there was a man in Jerusalem, whose name was Simeon; and the same man was just and devout, waiting for the consolation of Israel; and the Holy Ghost was upon him. And it was revealed unto him by the Holy Ghost, that he should not see death, before he had seen the Lord's Christ. And he came by the Spirit into the temple." *Mark*, ch. xii. ver. 36. "David himself said by the Holy Ghost, The Lord said to my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool." The Evangelist Matthew employs a similar expression, ch. xxii. ver. 43: "How then doth David in spirit call him Lord?" *Luke*, ch. iv. ver. 1: "And Jesus, being full of the Holy Ghost, returned from Jordan, and was led by the Spirit into the wilderness." It must not, therefore, be supposed, that the manifestation of this holy attribute of God, is peculiar to the Christian dispensation. We find in the Scriptures the term "God" applied figuratively in a finite sense to Christ, and to some other superiors, as I have already noticed in page

Digitized by Google

169: a circumstance which may possibly have tended to confirm such as are rendered from their early impressions partial to the doctrine of the Trinity, in their prepossessed notions of the deity of Jesus. But with respect to the Holy Ghost, I must confess my inability to find a single passage in the whole Scriptures, in which the Spirit is addressed as God, or as a person of God, so as to afford to believers of the Trinity an excuse for their profession of the Godhead of the Holy Ghost. The only anthorities they quote to this effect that I have met with are as follow: *Acts* ch. v. vers. 3, 4: "Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost? Thou hast not lied to men, but unto God." From which they conclude, He that lieth to the Holy Ghost, lieth to God. *John*, ch. xv. ver. 26: "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, who proceedeth from the Father, he will testify of me." As to the first of these texts, I need only remark, that any sin or blasphemy against one of the attributes of God is of course reckoned a sin or blasphemy against God himself But this admission amounts neither to a recognition of the self-existence of the attribute, nor of its identity with God. With respect to the mission of the Spirit of truth as a proof of its being a separate existence, and not merely an expression for the influence of God, the passage in question, if so taken, will thus run: "But when God is come, whom I (God) will send unto you from God, even God who

Digitized by Google

procedeth from God," &c. Can there be an idea more polytheistical than what flows from these words? Yet those that maintain this interpretation express their detestation of Polytheism. If with a view to soften the unreasonableness of this interpretation, they think themselves justified in having recourse to the term "mystery," they cannot without injustice accuse Hindoos, the believers of numerous Gods under one Godhead, of absurdity, when they plead mystery in defence of their Polytheism; for under the plea of mystery, every appearance of unreasonableness may be easily removed.

I find to my great surprise, that the plural form of expression in the 26th verse of the first chapter of Genesis, "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness," has been quoted by some divines as tending to prove the doctrine of the Deity of the Holy Ghost, and that of the Son, with the deity of the Father of the universe, commonly called the doctrine of the Trinity. It could scarcely be believed, if the fact were not too notorious that such eminent scholars as some of those divines undoubtedly were, could be liable to such a mistake, as to rely on this verse as a ground of argument in support of the Trinity. It shows how easily prejudice in favour of an already acquired opinion gets the better of learning, and how successfully it darkens the sphere of truth. Were we even to disregard totally the idiom of the Hebrew, Arabic, and of al-

Digitized by Google

most all Asiatic languages, in which the plural number is often used for the singular, to express the respect due to the person denoted by the noun: and to understand the term, "our image" and "our likeness," found in the verse as conveying a plural meaning, the quotation would still by no means answer their purpose; for the verse in question would in that case imply a plurality of Gods, without determining whether their number was three or three hundred, and of course without specifying their persons.—No middle point in the unlimited series of number being determined, it would be almost necessary for the purpose of obtaining some fixed number, as implied by those terms, to adopt either two, the lowest degree of plurality in the first personal pronoun both in Hebrew and Arabic, or to take the highest number of Gods with which human imagination has peopled the heavens. In the former case the verse cited might countenance the doctrine of the duality of the Godhead entertained by Zirdusht and his followers, representing the God of goodness, and the God of evil, to have jointly created man, composed of a mixed nature of good and evil propensities; in the latter it would be consistent with the Hindoo system of religion; but there is nothing in the words, that can be with any justice construed as pointing to Trinity. These are not the only difficulties attending the interpretation of those terms:—if they should be viewed in any other than a singular sense, they would in-

Digitized by Google

volve contradiction with the very next verse: "So God created man in his own image;" in which the singular number is distinctly used: as in *Deut.* ch. iv. ver. 4: "The Lord our God is one Lord?" and also with the spirit of the whole of the Old Testament.

To those who are tolerably versed in Hebrew and Arabic, (which is only a refined Hebrew,) it is a well known fact, that in the Jewish and Mohummudan Scriptures, as well as in common discourse, the plural form is often used in a singular sense when the superiority of the subject of discourse is intended to be kept in view: this is sufficiently apparent from the following quotations taken both from the Old Testament in Hebrew, and from the Qoran. *Exodus*, ch. xxi. ver. 4, In the original Hebrew Scripture אם ארניו יתן לו אשה "If his masters (meaning his master) have given him a wife." Verse 6, Hebrew, והגישו ארניו אל האלהים "Then his masters (that is, his master) shall bring him unto the Judges." Verse 29th, הוא מתסל שלשם והועד בבעליו ואם שור נגח "But if the ox were wont to push with his horn in time past, and it has been testified to his owners," (that is to his owner).—*Isaiah*, ch. vi. ver. 8, Hebrew, את מי אשלח ומי ילך לנו "To whom shall I send? and who will go for us?" (that is, for me.)

So also in the Qoran, "We are (meaning I am) nearer than the jugular vein." "(Surely we meaning I) created every thing in proportion." In these two texts of the Qoran, God is represented to have spo-

Digitized by Google

ken in the plural number, although, Mohummud cannot be supposed to have employed a mode of expression which he could have supposed capable of being considered favourable to the Trinity.

But what are we to think of such reasoning as that which finds a confirmation of the doctrine of the Trinity in the thrice repeated term "holy," in verse 3, chapter vi. of *Isaiah?* Following this mode of argument, the repetitions of the term "Eli, Eli," or "My God, my God," by Jesus in his human nature, in *Matthew*, ch. xxvii. ver. 46, equally establishes the quality of the God. So also the holy name of the Supreme Deity being composed of four letters, in the Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Arabic, and Sunscrit, clearly denotes the quadrality of the Godhead!!! but these and all similar modes of argument that have been resorted to, are worthy of notice only as they serve to exhibit the extraordinary force of prejudice and superstition.

The most extraordinary circumstance is, that some should quote in the support of the Trinity the following sentence: "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one;" representing it as the 7th verse, chap. v. of the first epistle of John. This is supposed to have been at first composed as a paraphrase upon what stands as verse 8th of the same chapter, ("and there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood; and these

Digitized by Google

three agree in one," and met with approbation. It was however for a length of time known only in oral circulation; but was afterwards placed in the margin of some editions, and at last introduced into the text, most probably in the fifteenth century, as an original verse. From that time it has been the common practice to insert this verse amongst those which are collected in support of the Trinitarian doctrine. It may have served in this way to confirm and strengthen prejudice, though few biblical critics ever attached the smallest value to it either way. This interpretation is so modern, and so obvious, that several Trinitarian Editors and Commentators of the Bible, such as Griesbach and Michaelis, (who never allowed their zeal for their sect to overcome the prudence and candour with which they were endowed,) have omitted to insert it in their late works on the New Testament; knowing perhaps that such an interpolation, so far from strengthening the doctrine they maintain, has excited great doubts as to the accuracy of other passages generally relied upon for its support.

We have already, I trust, seen distinctly that none of the lessons taught by Christ to his disciples teach us to believe in him as God; but as most Trinitarian authors assert that this doctrine was fully revealed by his Apostles speaking under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, it may be worth while to examine whether it be included by them amongst the doctrines of the Christian religion.

Digitized by Google

This question may be immediately determined by referring to the history of the Acts of the Apostles; for if the doctrine of the Trinity had been considered by them as an essential part of what they were commanded to teach, we should certainly find it insisted upon in the discourses they addressed to their converts. But we shall look in vain for any expression amongst those reported by Luke, that indicates the profession of such a belief by the Apostles themselves; far less that they exacted an acknowledgment of its truth, from those whom they admitted by the rite of Baptism into the faith of Christianity.

Acts, ch. ii. ver. 22: "Ye men of Israel, hear these words; Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know;" 32, "This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses." 36, "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." Ch. iii. vers. 22 and 23: "For Moses truly said unto the Fathers, a Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things, whatsoever he shall say unto you. And it shall come to pass, that every soul which will not hear that Prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people." Ch. iv. ver. 12: "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given

Digitized by Google

among men, whereby we must be saved." Vers. 26 and 27 : "The kings of the earth stood up, and the rulers were gathered together against the Lord, and against his Christ. For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed," &c. Ch. v. ver. 31 : "Him has God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins." Ch. vii. ver. 56 : "And said, behold I see the heavens open, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God." Ch. viii. vers. 37 and 38 : "And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. And he commanded the chariot to stand still : and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch ; and he baptised him." Ch. x. ver. 38 : "How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power." Ver. 42 : "And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he who was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead." Ch. xiii. ver. 38 : "Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins." Ch. xvii. ver. 3 : "Opening and alleging, that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead ; and that this Jesus, whom I preach unto you, is Christ."

Thus we find the Apostle never hesitated to hazard their lives by declaring before the Jews that

Digitized by Google

their master was a Prophet, the expected Messiah, the Son of the living God : which was equally offensive to their countrymen, as if they had called him God himself ; yet in none of the Sermons do we ever find them representing him as the true God. In the same manner, Jesus himself never assumed that character to himself, although he repeatedly avowed that he was the Messiah, the Son of God, whereby he knew that according to their law he would draw the penalty of death upon himself. As to the nature of those doctrines of Christianity deemed essential in the earliest times, I shall content myself with making a few extracts from the Ecclesiastical History of Mosheim, a celebrated author among Trinitarians, which will prove that the doctrine of the Trinity, so zealously maintained as fundamental by the generality of modern Christians, made not its appearance as an essential, or even a secondary article of Christian faith, until the commencement of the fourth century ; and then it was introduced after long and violent discussions by the majority of an assembly, who were supported by the authority of a monarch. Mosheim, Vol. I. p. 100 : " Nor in this first century was the distinction made between Christians of a more or less perfect order which took place afterwards : whoever acknowledged Christ as the Saviour of mankind, and made solemn profession of his confidence in him, was immediately baptised, and received into the Church." P. 411 : " Soon after its commencement, even in the year 317, a new contention arose in Egypt upon a sub-

Digitized by Google

ject of much higher importance, and with consequences of a yet more pernicious nature; the subject of this fatal controversy, which kindled such deplorable division throughout the Christian world, was the doctrine of three persons of the Godhead; a doctrine which in the three preceding centuries, had happily escaped the vain curiosity of human researches, and been left undefined and undetermined by any particular set of ideas. The Church indeed had frequently decided against the Sabellians and others, that there was a real difference between the Father and the Son, and that the Holy Ghost was distinct from them both; or as we commonly speak, that three distinct persons exist in the Deity; but the mutual relation of these persons to each other, and the nature of the distinction that subsists between them, are matters that hitherto were neither disputed nor explained, with respect to which the Church had consequently observed a profound silence:—nothing was declared to the faith of the Christians in this matter, nor were there any modes of expression prescribed as requisite to be used in speaking of the mystery. Hence it happened, that the Christian doctors entertained different sentiments upon this subject without giving the least offence, and discoursed variously concerning the distinction between Father, Son, and the Holy Ghost, each one following his respective opinion with the utmost liberty." On this quotation I beg leave to remark, that if, in the first and purest ages of Christianity, the followers of Christ entertained such different opinions

Digitized by Google

on the subject of the distinction between Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, without incurring the charge of heresy and heterodoxy, and without even breaking the tie of Christian affection towards each other, it is a melancholy contrast that the same freedom of opinion on this subject is not now allowed, nor the same mutual forbearance maintained amongst those who call themselves Christians. Moshiem, p. 412 : " In an assembly of Presbyters of Alexandria, the Bishop of that city, whose name was Alexander, expressed his sentiments on this head with a high degree of freedom and confidence, and maintained among other things, that the Son was not only of the same eminence and dignity, but also of the same essence with the Father : this assertion was opposed by Arius, one of the presbyters, a man of a subtile turn, and remarkable for his eloquence." Page 414 : " The Emperor Constantine, looking upon the subject of this controversy as a matter of small importance, and as little connected with the fundamental and essential doctrines of religion, contented himself at first with addressing a letter to the contending parties, in which he admonished them to put an end to their disputes; but when the Prince saw that his admonitions were without effect, and that troubles and commotions, which the passions of men too often mingle with religious disputes, were spreading and increasing daily throughout the empire, he assembled at length, in the year 325, the famous Council of Nice in Bithynia, wherein

Digitized by Google

the deputies of the Church Universal were summoned to put an end to this controversy. In this general council, after many keen debates and violent efforts of the two parties, the doctrine of Arius was condemned; Christ declared consubstantial or of the same essence with the Father; the vanquished Presbyter banished among the Illyrians, and his followers compelled to give their assent to the creed or confession of faith which was composed by this council." It must not escape the notice of my readers, that so late as the year 314, the doctrine of the Son being of the same nature with the Father, was supposed to be a matter of small importance, and little connected with the fundamental and essential doctrines of religion.

The reason for the majority being in favour of the three persons of the Godhead at the Council of Nice, may be easily accounted for, as I noticed before. More than nine tenths of the Christians of that age, including the emperor and princes, were Gentile converts, to whom the idea of a plurality of Gods was most familiar and acceptable, and to whose reason as well as practice the worship of a deity in the human shape was perfectly consonant, as appears from the following quotation, as well as from the Roman and Grecian histories. Moshiem, [Vol. I.] p. 25; "The deities of almost all nations were either ancient heroes renowned for noble exploits and worthy deeds, or kings and generals who had founded empires, or women become illustrious by remarkable actions or

Digitized by Google

useful inventions : the merit of these dis tinguish ed and eminent persons, contemplated by their posterity with an enthusiastic gratitude, was the reason of their being exalted to celestial honours." We find also in the Acts of the Apostles, Paul declared to be God by the people of Melita, and both Paul and Barnabas regarded as gods by the inhabitants of Lystra ; and the Saviour was ranked in the number of false gods even by professed heathens. *Acts*, ch. xxviii. ver. 6 : "Howbeit they looked when he (Paul) should have swollen or fallen down dead suddenly ; but after they had looked a great while, and saw no harm come to him, they changed their minds, and said he was a God." *Acts*, ch. xiv. ver. 11 : "The gods are come down to us in the likeness of men." Moshiem, [Vol. I.] p. 65 : "Many who were not willing to adopt the whole of the doctrines of Christianity, were nevertheless, as appears from undoubted records, so struck with the account of his life and actions, and so charmed with the sublime purity of his precepts, that they numbered him (Jesus) among the greatest heroes, nay even among the gods themselves." Page 66 ; "So illustrious was the fame of Christ's power grown after his resurrection from the dead, and the miraculous gifts shed from on high upon his apostles, that the Emperor Tiberius is said to have proposed his being enrolled among the gods of Rome, which the opposition of the senate hindered from taking effect." If some of the Heathens from the nature of their superstitions could rank Jesus

Digitized by Google

among their false gods, it is no wonder if others, when nominally converted to Christianity, should have placed him on an equality with the true God, and should have passed a decree, constituting him one of the persons of the Godhead. These facts coincide entirely with my own firm persuasion of the impossibility, that a doctrine so inconsistent with the evidence of the senses as that of three persons in one being, should ever gain the sincere assent of any one, into whose mind it has not been instilled in early education. Early impressions alone can induce a Christian to believe that three are one, and one is three; just as by the same means a Hindoo is made to believe that millions are one, and one is millions; and to imagine that an inanimate idol is a living substance, and capable of assuming various forms. As I have sought to attain the truths of Christianity from the words of the author of this religion, and from the undisputed instructions of his holy apostles, and not from a parent or tutor, I cannot help refusing my assent to any doctrine which I do not find scriptural.

Before concluding, I beg to revert to one or two arguments respecting the nature of Jesus Christ, which have been already partly touched upon. It is maintained that his nature was double, being divine as Son of God, and human as Son of man —that in the former capacity he performed miracles and exercised authority over the wind and the sea, and as man was subject to and experienced human feelings, joy and sorrow, pleasure and pain.

Digitized by Google

Is it possible to consider a being in the human shape, acting daily in a manner required by the nature of the human race as the invisible God, above mortality and all the feelings of mortal beings, from a mere figurative application of the terms " Son of God" or " God," to him, and from the circumstance of his performing wonderful works contrary to the usual course of nature? If so, what can prevent one from esteeming Moses and others, as possessed of both divine and human nature? since Moses likewise is called God distinctly. (*Exodus*, ch. vii. ver. 1: "I have made thee a God to Pharaoh;") and he is also called man, (" wherewith Moses, the man of God, blessed Israel." *Deut.* ch. xxxiii. ver. 1;) and consequently it may be alleged, that in his divine capacity, Moses performed miracles, and commanded the heavens and the earth. (" Give ear, O ye heavens, and I will speak; and hear, O earth, the words of my mouth,") *Deut.* ch. xxxii. ver. 1: " For it (the word of Moses) is not a vain thing for you, because *it is your life.*" ver. 47;) and that in his human capacity, he suffered death and other miseries. Neither Jesus nor Moses ever declared, "I say so, and perform this as God; and I say so, and perform that as man." If we give so great a latitude to the modes of reasoning employed to justify the idea of one being possessed of two sorts of consciousness, as God and man; two sorts of minds, divine and human; and two sets of souls. eternal and perishable; then we shall not only be at a

Digitized by Google

loss to know what is rational and what is absurd, but shall find our senses and experience of little or no use to us. The mode of interpreting the Scriptures which is universally adopted, is this, that when two terms seemingly contradictory are applied to one person, then that which is most consistent with reason and with the context should be taken in a literal, and the other in a figurative sense. Thus God is declared to be immaterial, and yet to have hands, eyes, &c. The latter expression taken literally, being inconsistent with reason, and with other passages of the Scriptures, are understood as metaphorically implying his power and knowledge, while the former is interpreted in its strict and literal sense: in like manner the term "Lord God," &c. applied to any other than the Supreme Being, must be figuratively understood. Were any one, in defiance of this general mode of interpretation, to insist that the term "God," applied to Jesus, should be taken in its literal sense, and that consequently Jesus should be actually considered God in the human shape, he would not only acknowledge the same intimate connexion of matter with God, that exists between matter and the human soul, but also would necessarily justify the application of such phrases as "Mother of God" to the Virgin Mary, and "Brother of God" to James and others, which are highly derogatory to the character of the Supreme Author of the universe; and it is the use of phrases similar to these which has rendered the religion of the

Digitized by Google

Hindoos so grossly absurd and contemptible. To admit that all things, whether possible or impossible to our understanding, are possible for God, is certainly favourable to the idea of a mixed nature of God and man: but at the same time would be highly detrimental both to religion and society; for all sorts of positions and tales,. however impossi le they may be, might in that case be advanced and supported on the same plea.

I now conclude my reply, with noticing in a brief manner the modes of illustration that Trinitarians adopt both in conversation and in writing in support of the unity of the Godhead, in consistency with the distinction of three persons. 1st; That as the soul, will, and preception, though they are three things, yet are in fact one, so God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, though distinct persons, are to be esteemed as one. Admitting for a moment the propriety of this analogy, it serves to destroy totally their position, as to the three existences of the Godhead being distinct substances; for, according to the established system of theology, the soul is believed to be the substance, and will and perceptions its properties, which have no distinct existence; in the same manner as weight and locality are the properties of matter, without having existence as separate substances. If this analogy then were to hold good, the Father would be acknowledged as a separate existence like the soul, but the Son and the Holy Spirit must be considered his attributes, as will and perception are of the soul: a

Digitized by Google

doctrine which resembles that of the heretic Sabellius and the early Egyptian Christians.

It is therefore necessary, that, in endeavouring to prove the reasonableness of the idea respecting the unity of three distinct substances of the Godhead, from comparison between them, and the soul, and its will and perception, they should establish first that the soul, will, and perception, are three substances, and that they are at the same time one; and then should draw such an analogy, showing the possibility of the position which they assume.

2ndly, That as notwithstanding the distinct existence of the sun, his rays of light and his rays of heat, they are considered as one; so God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, though separate substances, are one. Were we to admit the separate existence of heat, a point still disputed among philosophers, it would serve as an analogy so far as those three distinct substances, though different in nature, are connected together; but by no means would answer the purpose of illustrating their position, that these distinct persons are one in nature and essence; for the sun is acknowledged to be a compact body; rays of light are fluid substances subject to absorption, and frequently found emanating from other bodies, as well as the sun; and heat, an existence of which the most remarkable property is its power of expanding other substances, is frequently unaccompanied by the rays of the sun. But it is universally acknowledged, that whatever ar-

Digitized by Google

gument tends to prove a distinction between substances, must necessarily overturn their unity in essence and existence ; and therefore the unity in nature and essence which they assert to exist in the three persons of the Godhead not being found in the sun, light, and heat, the analogy attempted to be drawn must be abandoned. Again, it is advanced, that as a single substance possesses various qualities, and consequently is viewed differently ; so the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, are in fact one God ; yet the Deity in his capacity of Creator of the world is called the Father, and in his capacity of Mediator is termed the Son, in which he is generally supposed inferior to the Father ; and in his office of sanctification is named the Holy Ghost, in which he is deemed inferior to both. I know not whether to consider such an argument as reasoning, or as a mockery of reason ; since it justifies us in believing, that one and the same being in one of his capacities is superior to himself, and again in reference to another quality is inferior to himself ; that he is in one case his own beloved Son, and then in another capacity is at the disposal of himself according to the entreaty of his Son. This mode of arguing, after all, serves to deny the Trinity, which represents the Godhead as consisting of three distinct persons, and not as one person possessing different attributes, which it is the object of Trinitarians to prove. They allege the united state of the soul and the body as analogous to the union of the Father and Son ; but no one

Digitized by Google

who believes in the s eparate existence of the soul, can for a moment sup pose it to be of the same essence as the body ; so that unless they admit the immateriality of the Father alone, and assert the materiality of the Son in his pre-existent state, this illustration also must be set aside.

Some allege, that as the Son of man designates human nature, so the Son of God expresses the nature of God. Were we to admit the term "God" as a common noun, and not a proper name, and Godhead as a genus like mankind, &c. and that Jesus was actually begotten of the Deity, this mode of reasoning would stand good; but Godhead must in this case be brought to a level with other genera, capable of performing animal functions, &c.

Some represent God as a compound substance, consisting of three parts, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, a representation in support of which they can offer no scriptural authority. I would however wish to know, whether these parts (Father, Son and Spirit) are of the same nature and existence, or each possessed of a different nature or essence. In the former case, there would be a total impossibility of composition ; for composition absolutely requires articles or parts of different identity and essence ; nothing being capable of composition with itself. Besides, the idea of such a compound substance is inconsistent with that dictinct personality of Father, Son, and Spirit, which they maintain.—In the latter case, (that is, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit

Digitized by Google

being of different natures,) a composition of these three parts is not impossible; but it destroys the opinion which they entertain respecting the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, being of the same nature and essence, and of course implies, that the Godhead is liable to divisibility.

The argument so adduced by them would include in reality a denial of the epithet God to each part of the Godhead; for no portion of an existence, either ideal or perceptible in a true sense, can be called the existence itself; as it is one of the first axioms of abstract truth, that a part is less than the whole; but we find in the Scriptures the Father constantly called God in the strict and full signification of the term. *John*, ch. xvii. ver. 3: "This is life eternal, that they may know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." 1 *Cor*. ch. xv. ver. 24: "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father." 1 *Cor* ch. viii. ver. 6: "To us there is but one God, the Father." *Ephesians*, ch. iv. vers. 5, 6: "One Lord, one faith, one baptism; one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all."

Another argument which has great weight with that sect is, that unless Jesus is God and man, he cannot be considered as qualified to perform the office of mediator between God and man; because it is only by this compound character that he intercedes for the guilty creatures with their offend-

Digitized by Google

ed God. This mode of reasoning is most evidently opposed to common sense, as well as to the Scriptures; though their zeal in support of the Trinity has not permitted them to see it. I say, opposed to common sense; because we observe, that when any one feels angry with and inclined to punish one of a herd of cattle which may have trespassed on his grounds, or when a rider wishes to chastise his horse on account of its viciousness, it is his friend or neighbour generally who intercedes in its behalf, and is successful in procuring mercy to the offending animal, in his simple nature, without assuming in addition that of the creature in whose behalf he intercedes.—I say, opposed to scripture; because we find in the sacred writings, that Abraham, Moses, and other Prophets, stood mediators and interceded successfully in behalf of an offending people with their offended God; but none of them possessed the double nature of God and man. *Numb.* ch. xi. vers. 1, 2; "When the people complained it displeased the Lord; and the Lord heard it, and his anger was kindled, and the fire of the Lord burnt among them, and consumed them that were in the uttermost parts of the camp. And the people cried unto Moses; and when Moses prayed unto the Lord, the fire was quenched." Ch. xiv. vers. 19, 20, Moses prayed to the Lord, "Pardon, I beseech thee, the iniquity of this people, according unto the greatness of thy mercy, and as thou hast forgiven this people, from Egypt even until now. And the Lord said, I have pardoned them according

Digitized by Google

to thy word." Ch. xxi. ver. 7: "Therefore the people came to Moses, and said, We have sinned, for we have spoken against the Lord, and against thee: pray unto the Lord that he take away the serpents from us: and Moses prayed for the people." *Exod.* ch. xxxii. ver. 30: "And it came to pass on the morrow, that Moses said unto the people, Ye have sinned a great sin, and now I will go up unto the Lord, peradventure I shall make an atonement for your sins." *Gen.* ch. xviii. ver. 32: "And he (Abraham) said, O let not the Lord be angry, and I will speak yet but this once, —peradventure ten shall be found there. And he said, I will not destroy it for ten's sake." I find several others performing the office of mediator and intercessor in common with Jesus, as I noticed before; and indeed this seems to have been an office common to all Prophets: but none of them is supposed to have been clothed with Godhead and manhood in union. *Jeremiah*, ch. xxvii. ver. 18: "But if they be Prophets, and if the word of the Lord be with them, let them now make intercession to the Lord of Hosts," &c. *Deuter.* ch. v. ver. 5: "I (Moses) stood between the Lord and you at that time, to show you the word of the Lord." I regret very much that a sect generally so enlightened, should on the one hand have supposed the divine and human natures to be so diametrically opposed to each other, that it is morally impossible for God even to accept intercession from a mere human being in behalf of the human race, and on the other hand should have

Digitized by Google

advanced that the Deity joined to his own nature that of man, and was made flesh, possessing all the members and exercising all the functions of man—propositions which are morally inconsistent with each other.

To avoid the supposed dishonour attached to the appointment of a mediator less than divine, the Deity is declared by them to have assumed the human shape, and to have subjected himself to the feelings and inclinations natural to the human species; which is not only inconsistent with the immutable nature of God, but highly derogatory to the honour and glory which we are taught to ascribe to him.

Other arguments of the same nature are frequently advanced, but they are all together much fewer in number, and far less convincing, than those which are commonly brought forward by Hindoos to support their Polytheism. Since, then, in evincing the truth and excellence of the Precepts of Jesus, there is no need of the aid of metaphysical arguments, and since as a last resource they do not depend for their support on the ground of mystery, the Compiler has in the discharge of his duty towards his countrymen, properly introduced them as a Guide to Peace and Happiness.

Digitized by Google

APPENDIX.

No. 1.

On the Quotations from the Old Testament contained in the New.

It cannot have escaped the notice of attentive readers of the Scriptures, that the bare quotations in the New Testament from the Old, when unaccompanied with their respective contexts, are liable to be misunderstood. Those who are not well versed in the sacred writings, finding in those references such phrases as apparently corroborate their already acquired opinions, not only lay stress upon them, in support of the sentiments generally adopted, but even lead others very often, though unintentionally, into great errors.

Thus *Matthew* ii. 15: "Out of Egypt have I called my Son." The Evangelist refers to chapter xi. verse 1. of *Hosea;* which, though really applied to Israel, represented there as the Son of God, is used by the apostle in reference to the Saviour, in consideration of a near resemblance between their circumstances in this instance: both Israel and Jesus were carried into Egypt, and recalled from thence, and both were denominated in the Scriptures the "Son of God." The passage of Hosea thus runs, from chapter xi. vers. 1st to the 3d: "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my Son out of Egypt. As they called them, so they went from them: they sacri-

Digitized by Google

ficed unto Baalim, and burnt incense to graven images. I taught Ephraim also to go, taking them by their arms; but they knew not that I healed them." In which Israel, who is represented as a child of God, is declared to have sacrificed to Baalim, and to have burnt incense to graven images—circumstances which cannot justly be ascribed to the Saviour.

With a view, therefore, to remove the possibility of such errors, and to convince my readers that all the references in the New Testament, with their contexts, manifest the unity of God, and natural inferiority of the Messiah to the Father of the universe, I have endeavoured to arrange them methodically, beginning with such quotations as were made by Jesus himself, agreeably to the proposal of the Reverend Editor.

Quotations by Jesus himself, exactly agreeing with the Hebrew.

Matthew, iv. 4, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God:" the same in *Luke* iv. 4, compared with *Deut.* viii. 3, "And he humbled thee, and suffered thee to hunger, and fed thee with manna, which thou knewest not, neither did thy fathers know; that he might make thee know, that man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord doth man live."

Matthew iv. 7, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God"—compared with *Deut.* vi. 16, 17, "Ye shall not tempt the Lord your God, as ye tempted him in Massah. Ye shall diligently keep the commandments of the Lord your God, and his testimonies, and his statutes, which he hath commanded thee."

Digitized by Google

Matthew ix. 13, "But go ye and learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice"—compared with *Hosea* vi. 5, 6, "Therefore have I hewed them by the prophets; I have slain them by the words of my mouth; and thy judgments are as the light that goeth forth. For I desired mercy, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings."

Matthew xix. 19, xxii. 39, "Honour thy father and thy mother: and, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself"—compared with *Exodus* xx. 12, "Honour thy father and mother, that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee"—and *Leviticus* xix. 18, "Thou shalt not avenge nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people; but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself: I am the Lord."

Matthew xxi. 42, "The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the *Lord's doing*, and it is marvellous in our eyes;" the same in *Mark* xii. 10, *Luke* xx. 17, compared with *Psalm* cxviii. 22, 23, "I (says David) will praise thee; for thou hast heard me, and art become my salvation. The stone which the builders refused is become the headstone of the corner. This is the Lord's doing; it is marvellous in our eyes." To decide whether this passage is principally applied to David, and in the way of accommodation to Jesus, or originally to Jesus himself, is entirely left to the discretion of my readers; but it is evident, in either case, that it is God that has *raised* the *stone so rejected*.

Matthew xxii. 44, "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool:" the same in *Mark* xii. 36, *Luke* xx. 42, compared with *Psalm* cx. 1, 2, "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit

Digitized by Google

thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies." This passage is simply applied to the Messiah, manifesting that the victory gained by him over his enemies was entirely owing to the influence of God.

John x. 35, "Ye are gods"—compared with *Psalm* lxxxii. 1, 6, 7, "God standeth in the congregation of the mighty; he judgeth among the gods. I have said, Ye are gods, and all of you are children of the Most High: but ye shall die like men, and fall like one of the princes;" wherein Jesus shows from this quotation, that the term God is figuratively applicable in the Scriptures to creatures of a superior nature.

Quotations made by Jesus himself, nearly agreeing with the Hebrew.

Matthew iv. 10, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only thou shalt serve"—compared with *Deut.* vi. 13, "Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him, and shalt swear by his name."

Matthew xiii. 14, "By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive"—compared with *Isaiah* vi. 9, and its context, "I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, Whom shall I send, and who will go for us? Then said I, (Isaiah,) Here am I, send me. And he said, Go and tell this people, Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not." This censure has original reference to the conduct of the people to whom Isaiah was sent, but it is applied by Jesus in an accommodated sense to that of the Jews of his time.

Digitized by Google

Matthew xix. 5, "For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh"—compared with *Genesis* ii. 23. "And Adam said, This is now bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called woman; because she was taken out of man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh."

Matthew xix. 18, 19, "Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Honour thy father and thy mother: and, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself"—compared with *Exodus* xx. 12--16, "Honour thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee. Thou shalt not kill. Thou shalt not commit adultery. Thou shalt not steal. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour."

Matthew xxii. 32, "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob"—compared with *Exodus* iii. 6, "Moreover he said, I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. And Moses hid his face; for he was afraid to look upon God."

Matthew xxii. 37, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy mind:" the same in *Mark* xii. 30, *Luke* x. 27, compared with *Deut.* vi. 5, "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might."

Matthew xxvi. 31, "Then saith Jesus unto them, All ye shall be offended because of me this night: for it is written, I will smite the Shepherd, and the sheep of the

Digitized by Google

flock shall be scattered abroad"—compared with *Zechariah* xiii. 7, "Awake, O sword, against my Shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow,* saith the Lord of hosts: smite the Shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered; and I will turn mine hand upon the little ones."

Verse 7 either was originally applied to Agrippa, אגריפה the last king of the Jews, whose subjects were scattered after he had been smitten with the sword, and in an accommodated sense is applied by Jesus to himself, whose disciples were in like manner dispersed, while he was suffering afflictions from his enemies—or is directly applicable to Jesus; but in both cases his total subordination and submission to the Father of the universe is too obvious to be disputed.

John vi. 45, "It is written in the Prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man, therefore, that hath heard and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me"—compared with *Isaiah* liv. 13, "And all thy children shall be taught of the Lord; and great shall be the peace of thy children."

John xiii. 18, "I speak not of you all; I know whom I have chosen: but that the Scripture may be fulfilled, He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heels against me"—compared with *Psalm* xli. 9, "Mine own familiar friend, in whom I trusted, which did eat of my bread, hath lifted up his heel against me," is immediately applicable to David and his friend Ahithophel, who betrayed him; and secondarily, to Jesus, and Judas, his traitorous apostle.

* The word עמירת found in the original Hebrew scripture, signifies one that lives near another; therefore the word "fellow" in the English translation is not altogether correct, as justly observed by Archbishop Newcome.

Digitized by Google

John xv. 25, "But this cometh to pass, that the word might be fulfilled that is written in their law, They hated me without a cause"—compared with *Psalm* cix. 2, 3, "They have spoken against me with a lying tongue. They compassed me about also with words of hatred; and fought against me without a cause." Verse 3d was originally applied to David and his enemies, and in an accommodated sense to Jesus and the Jews of his day.

Quotation made by Jesus himself, agreeing with the Hebrew in sense, but not in words.

Matthew xxi. 16, "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise"—compared with *Ps.* viii. 2, and its preceding verse, "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast ordained strength, because of thine enemies; that thou mightest still the enemy and the avenger."

Quotation taken from combined Passages of Scripture.

Matthew xxi. 13, "And said unto them, It is written, My house shall be called the house of prayer: but you have made it a den of thieves"—compared with *Isaiah* lvi. 17, "For mine house shall be called the house of prayer for all people." Ch. vii. 11, "Is this house which is called by my name become a den of robbers in your eyes?"

Quotation differing from the Hebrew, but agreeing with the Septuagint.

Matthew xv. 7—9, "Ye hypocrites, well did Esaias prophesy of you, saying, This people draweth nigh unto

Digitized by Google

me with their mouth, and honoureth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men"—compared with *Isaiah* xxix. 13, which in the Septuagint corresponds exactly with the Gospel, but which in verse 9, differs from the original Hebrew, thus translated in the common version: "And their fear towards me is taught by the precepts of men."

Quotations in which there is reason to suspect a different Reading in Hebrew, or that the Apostles understood the words in a sense different from that expressed in our Lexicons.

Matthew xi. 10, "This is he of whom it is written, Behold, I send my messenger *before thy face,* who shall prepare thy way before *thee*"—compared with *Malachi* iii. 1, "Behold I *will* send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before *me.*" *Matthew* xxvi. 31, "I will smite the Shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad"—compared with *Zechariah* vii. 8, "Smite the Shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered."

Luke iv. 8, "Thou shalt *worship* the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve"—compared with *Deut.* vi. 13, "Thou shalt *fear* the Lord thy God, and serve him."

Quotations slightly varying from the Septuagint.

Luke iv. 18, 19, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and *recovering of sight to the blind;* to set at liberty them that are bruised; to

Digitized by Google

preach the acceptable year of the Lord"—compared with *Isaiah* lxi. 1, 2, "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek: he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord."

Now I beg the attention of my readers to these quotations ascribed to Jesus himself, and to appeal to them, whether he assumed in any of these references the character of the Deity, or even equality with him. I am certain that they will find nothing of the kind: Jesus declared himself in these instances entirely subordinate to the Almighty God, and subject to his authority, and frequently compared himself to David or some of the other Prophets.

Digitized by Google

No. II.

On the Refferences made to the Old Testament in Support of the Deity of Jesus.

TRINITARIAN Divines quote *John* i. 14, " And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth," as a reference to *Isaiah*, ix. 6, " For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder ; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace,"— though the evangelist John *made no allusion* to this passage of *Isaiah* in the verse in question. The passage of *Isaiah* thus referred to was applied to *Hezekiah*, the son of Ahaz, figuratively designated as the son ot the virgin, the daughter of Zion, to wit, Jerusalem, foretold by the Prophet as the deliverer of the city from the hands of its enemies, though its utter destruction was then threatened by the kings of Syria and Israel. The words " a virgin," according to the English translation, are " the virgin," both in the original Hebrew and in the Greek of the Gospel of *Matthew*, as well as in the Septuagint. But unless Ahaz was aware of the allusion of the Prophet, the use of the definite article in this passage must be quite inexplicable ; and no one will contend for a moment, that it was given to that wicked king to understand that the mother of Christ was the virgin alluded to ; what then could Ahaz have comprehended by the expression " the virgin ?" On

Digitized by Google

referring to 2 *Kings*, xix. 21, we find the same Prophet make use of the very expression, where he informs the king, *Hezekiah*, of the denunciation of God against Sennacherib, the blasphemous king of Assyria, who was at that time besieging Jerusalem. "This is the word that the Lord hath spoken concerning him; *The virgin*, the daughter of Zion, hath despised thee, and laughed thee to scorn."—It is impossible to conceive that these words, expressly spoken of the king of Assyria, bear any allusion to the virgin, the mother of Christ; and it illustrates clearly the otherwise obscure expression of the Prophet addressed to Ahaz, when he foretold to him the happy reign of his successor Hezekiah. In *Isaiah*, x. 32, "He (the king of Assyria) shall shake his hand against the mount of the daughter of Zion, the hill of Jerusalem." The epithet "The daughter of Zion," which in the last passage was used as synonymous with "the virgin," here signifies Jerusalem itself, in which sense it was commonly used in the figurative language of the Prophet, and no doubt well understood by Ahaz: for we find the same words in many other passages used to signify either a city or the people of a city. *Isaiah*, xxii. 12: "And he said, Thou shalt no more rejoice, O thou oppressed *virgin*, daughter of Zion." Ch. xlvii. 1: "Come down, and sit in the dust, O *virgin* daughter of Babylon."—*Jeremiah* xiv. 17: "Therefore thou shalt say this word unto them: Let mine eyes run down with tears night and day, and let them not cease; for the *virgin* daughter of my people is broken with a great breach." Ch. xviii. 13: "Therefore thus saith the Lord; Ask ye now among the heathen, who hath heard such things; the *virgin* of Israel hath done a very horrible thing." Ch. xxxi. 4: "Again I will build thee, and thou shalt be built, O *virgin* of Israel; thou

Digitized by Google

shalt again be adorned with thy tabrets, and shalt go forth in the dances of them that make merry." Ver. 13: "Then shall the *virgin* rejoice in the dance." &c. Ver. 21: "Set thee up waymarks, make thee high heaps: set thine heart toward the highway, even the way which thou wentest: turn again, O *virgin* of Israel, turn again to these thy cities." *Lam.* i. 15: "The Lord hath trodden the *virgin*, the daughter of Judah, as in a wine press." Ch. ii. 13: "What thing shall I take to witness for thee? what thing shall I liken to thee, O daughter of Jerusalem? what thing shall I liken to thee, O *virgin* daughter of Zion? for thy breach is great like the sea; who can heal thee?" *Amos*, v. 2: "The *virgin* of Israel is fallen, she shall no more rise: she is forsaken upon her land; there is none to raise her up."

To show that the passages in question, as well as all that is foretold in this and the succeeding chapters, refer to the reign of Hezekiah, nothing more than a comparison of them with the records of that reign is requisite. I shall therefore lay before my readers all those verses in these chapters that are commonly referred to by Trinitarians as alluding to the coming of Christ, with their contexts, together with such parts of the history of the reign of Hezekiah as appear to me to be clearly indicated by those passages.

Isaiah, vii. 1: "And it came to pass in the days of Ahaz, the son of Jotham, the son of Uzziah, king of Judah, that Rezin the king of Syria, and Pekah the son of Remaliah, king of Israel, went up toward Jerusalem to war against it, but could not prevail against it. 2, And it was told the house of David, saying, Syria is confederate with Ephraim. And his heart was moved, and the heart of his people, as the trees of the wood are moved with the wind.

Digitized by Google

3, Then said the Lord unto Isaiah, Go forth now to meet Ahaz, thou, and Shearjashub thy son, at the end of the conduit of the upper pool in the highway of the fuller's field; 4, And say unto him, Take heed and be quiet; fear not, neither be faint-hearted, for the two tails of these smoking firebrands, for the fierce anger of Rezin with Syria, and of the son of Remaliah. 5, Because Syria, Ephraim, and the son of Remaliah, have taken evil counsel against thee, saying, 6, Let us go up against Judah, and vex it, and let us make a breach therein for us, and set a king in the midst of it, *even* the son of Tabeal: 7, Thus saith the Lord God, it shall not stand, neither shall it come to pass. 8, For the head of Syria is Damascus, and the head of Damascus *is* Rezin; and within threescore and five years shall Ephraim be broken, that it be not a people. 9, And the head of Ephraim is Samaria, and the head of Samaria is Remaliah's son. If ye will not believe, surely ye shall not be established. 10, Moreover, the Lord spake again unto Ahaz, saying, 11, Ask thee a sign of the Lord thy God; ask it either in the depth, or in the height above. 12, But Ahaz said, I will not ask, neither will I tempt the Lord. 13, And he said, Hear ye now, O house of David, Is it a small thing for you to weary men, but will ye weary my God also? 14, Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, the virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. 15, Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil, and choose the good. 16, For before the child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings. 17, The Lord shall bring upon thee, and upon thy people, and upon thy father's house,

Digitized by Google

days that have not come, from the day that Ephraim departed from Judah ; even the king of Assyria."

Chap. viii. 5 : " The Lord spake also unto me again, saying, 6, Forasmuch as this people refuseth the waters of Shiloah that go softly, and rejoice in Rezin and Remaliah's son ; 7, Now therefore, behold, the Lord bringeth up upon them the waters of the river, strong and many, even the king of Assyria, and all his glory ; and he shall come up over all the channels, and go over all his banks ; 8, And he shall pass through Judah ; he shall overflow and go over,—he shall reach even to the neck ; and the stretching out of his wings shall fill the breadth of thy land, O Immanuel."

Chap. ix. 1 : " Nevertheless, the dimness shall not be such as was in her vexation, when at the first he lightly afflicted the land of Zebulon, and the land of Naphtali, and afterwards did more grievously afflict her by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan in Galilee of the nations. 2, The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light : they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined. 3, Thou hast multiplied the nation, and not increased the joy : they joy before thee according to the joy in harvest, and as men rejoice when they divide the spoil. 4, For thou hast broken the yoke of his burden, and the staff of his shoulder, the rod of his oppressor, as in the day of Midian. 5, For every battle of the warrior is with confused noise, and garments rolled in blood ; but this shall be with burning and fuel of fire. For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given : and the government shall be upon his shoulder : and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. 7,

Digitized by Google

Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end,* upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this."

Chap. x. 5: "O Assyrian, the rod of mine anger, and the staff in their hand is mine indignation. 6, I will send him against an hypocritical nation, and against the people of my wrath will I give him a charge, to take the spoil, and to take the prey, and to tread them down like the mire of the streets. 7, Howbeit he meaneth not so, neither doth his heart think so, but it is in his heart to destroy and cut off nations not a few. 8, For he saith, Are not my princes altogether kings? 9, Is not Calno as Carchemish? is not Hamath as Arpad? is not Samaria as Damascus?† 10, As my hand hath found the kingdoms of the idols, and whose graven images did excel them of Jerusalem and of Samaria; 11, Shall I not, as I have done unto Samaria and her idols, so do to Jerusalem and her idols? 12, Wherefore it shall come to pass, that, when the Lord hath performed his whole work upon mount Zion and on Jerusalem, I will punish the fruit of the stout

* Those that are at all versed in scriptural language will attach no weight to the terms "no end" and "for ever," found in ch. v. 7; for the former often signifies plenteousness, and the latter long, but not eternal duration. Vide Eccl. iv 16: "There is no end of all the people, even of all that have been before them." Isaiah ii. 7: "Neither is there any end of their treasure, neither is there any end of their chariots." Nahum ii. 9: "There is none end of their store." *Ch.* iii. 3: "And there is none end of their corpses." Psalm cxlv. 2, 9: "I will praise thy name for *ever and ever.*" Deut. xv. 17: "And he shall be thy servant *for ever.*"

† Compare vers. 9—11, with the historical relation of the vain boastings of the Assyrian, narrated in 2 Kings xviii. 33—35.

Digitized by Google

heart of the king of Assyria, and the glory of his high looks."—16, "Therefore shall the Lord, the Lord of hosts, send among his fat ones leanness; and under his glory he shall kindle a burning like the burning of a fire. 17, And the light of Israel shall be for a fire, and his *Holy One* for a flame: and it shall burn and devour his thorns and briers in one day."—24, "Therefore thus saith the Lord God of hosts, O my people that dwellest in Zion, be not afraid of the Assyrian: he shall smite thee with a rod, and shall lift up his staff against thee, after the manner of Egypt. 25, For yet a very little while, and the indignation shall cease, and mine anger, in their destruction." 27,* "And it shall come to pass in that day, that his burden shall be taken away from off thy shoulder, and his yoke from off thy neck, and the yoke shall be destroyed because of the anointing."

2 *Kings* xviii. 1: "Now it came to pass, in the third year of Hoshea son of Elah king of Israel, that Hezekiah the son of Ahaz king of Judah began to reign. 2, Twenty and five years old was he when he began to reign; and he reigned twenty and nine years in Jerusalem: his mother's name also was Abi, the daughter of Zachariah. 3, And he did that which was right in the sight of the Lord, according to all that David his father did. 4, He removed the high places, and brake the images, and cut down the groves, and brake in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made: for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it; and he called it Nehushtan. 5, He trusted in the Lord God of Israel; so that *after him* was none like him among all the kings of Judah, nor any that

* Compare with 2 Kings xvi. 7, "So Ahaz sent messengers to Tiglath-pileser King of Assyria, saying, I am thy servant and thy son," &c. and ch. xviii. 7, as above.

Digitized by Google

were *before him*. 6, For he clave to the Lord, and departed not from following him, but kept his commandments, which the Lord commanded Moses. 7, And the Lord was with him: and he prospered whithersoever he went forth: and he rebelled against the king of Assyria and served him not. 8, He smote the Philistines, even unto Gaza, and the borders thereof, from the tower of the watchmen to the fenced city."—17, "And the king of Assyria sent Tartan, and Rabsaris, and Rab-shakeh, from Lachish to king Hezekiah, with a great host against Jerusalem. And they went up and came to Jerusalem. And when they were came up, they came and stood by the conduit of the upper pool, which is in the highway of the fuller's field."—28, "Then Rab-shakeh stood, and cried with a loud voice in the Jews' language, and spake, saying, Hear the word of the great king, the king of Assyria: 29, Thus saith the king, Let not Hezekiah deceive you: for he shall not be able to deliver you out of his hand: 30, Neither let Hezekiah make you trust in the Lord, saying, The Lord will surely deliver us, and this city shall not be delivered into the hand of the king of Assyria. 31, Hearken not unto Hezekiah: for thus saith the king of Assyria, Make an agreement with me by a present, and come out to me, and then eat ye every man of his own vine, and every one of his fig-tree, and drink ye every one the waters of his cistern: 32, Until I come and take you away to a land like your own land; a land of corn and wine, a land of bread and vineyards, a land of oil-olive and of honey, that ye may live, and not die: and hearken not unto Hezekiah, when he persuadeth you, saying The Lord will deliver us. 33, Hath any of the gods of the nations delivered at all his land out of the hand of the king of Assyria? 34, Where are the gods of Hamath, and of Arpad? where

Digitized by Google

are the gods of Sepharvaim, Hena, and Ivah? have they delivered Samaria out of mine hand? 35, Who are they among all the gods of the countries that have delivered their country out of mine hand, that the Lord should deliver Jerusalem out of mine hand?"

Chap. xix. 15, "And Hezekiah prayed before the Lord, and said, O Lord God of Israel, which dwellest between the cherubims, thou art the God, even thou alone, of all the kingdoms of the earth; thou hast made heaven and earth. 16, Lord, bow down thine ear, and hear: open, Lord, thine eyes, and see: and hear the words of Sennacherib, which hath sent him to reproach the living God." 19, "Now therefore, O Lord our God, I beseech thee save thou us out of his hand, that all the kingdoms of the earth may know that thou art the Lord God, even thou only. 20, Then Isaiah the son of Amoz sent to Hezekiah, saying, Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, That which thou hast prayed to me against Sennacherib king of Assyria I have heard. 21, This is the word that the Lord hath spoken concerning him; *The virgin, the daughter of Zion*, hath despised thee, and laughed thee to scorn; the daughter of Jerusalem hath shaken her head at thee. 22, Whom hast thou reproached and blasphemed? and against whom hast thou exalted thy voice, and lifted up thine eyes on high? even against the Holy One of Israel. 23, By the messengers thou hast reproached the Lord, and hast said, With the multitude of my chariots I am come up to the height of the mountains, to the sides of Lebanon, and will cut down the tall cedar trees thereof, and the choice fir trees thereof: and I will enter into the lodgings of his borders, and into the forest of his Carmel."—27, "But I know thy abode, and thy going out, and thy coming in, and thy rage against me. 28, Because thy rage against me and thy

Digitized by Google

tumult is come up into mine ears, therefore I will put my hook in thy nose, and my bridle in thy lips, and I will turn thee back by the way by which thou camest." 32, "Therefore thus saith the Lord concerning the king of Assyria, He shall not come into this city, nor shoot an arrow there, nor come before it with a shield, nor cast a bank against it. 33, By the way that he came, by the same shall he return, and shall not come into this city, saith the Lord. 34, For I will defend this city, to save it, for mine own sake, and for my servant David's sake. 35, And it came to pass that night, that the angel of the Lord went out, and smote in the camp of the Assyrians an hundred fourscore and five thousand: and when they arose early in the morning, behold, they were all dead corpses. 36, So Sennacherib king of Assyria departed, and went and returned, and dwelt at Nineveh. 37, And it came to pass, as he was worshipping in the house of Nisroch his god, that Adrammelech and Sharezer his sons smote him with the sword; and they escaped into the land of Armenia: and Esar-haddon his son reigned in his stead."

2 *Chron.* xxx. 24: "For Hezekiah king of Judah did give to the congregation a thousand bullocks, and seven thousand sheep; and the princes gave to the congregation a thousand bullocks, and ten thousand sheep: and a great number of priests sanctified themselves. 25, And all the congregation of Judah, with the priests and the Levites, and all the congregation that came out of Israel, and the strangers that came out of the land of Israel, and that dwelt in Judah, rejoiced. 26, So there was great joy in Jerusalem; for since the time of Solomon, the son of David king of Israel, there was not the like in Jerusalem. 27, Then the priests and the Levites arose and blessed the

Digitized by Google

people : and their vôice was heard, and their prayer came up to his holy dwelling-place, even unto heaven."

Chap. xxxi. 20 : "And thus did Hezekiah throughout all Judah, and wrought that which was good and right and truth before the Lord his God. 21, And in every work that he began in the service of the house of God, and in the law, and in the commandments, to seek his God, he did it with all his heart, and prospered."

Chap. xxxii. 23 : " And many brought gifts unto the Lord to Jerusalem, and presents to Hezekiah king of Judah : so that he was magnified in the sight of all nations from thenceforth." 33, " And Hezekiah slept with his fathers, and they buried him in the chiefest of the sepulchres of the sons of David : and all Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem did him honour at his death. And Manasseh his son reigned in his stead "

If, as is declared by Trinitarians, the child promised in ch. vii. 14, be the same that is alluded to in ch. ix. 6, and ch. x. 17, it is quite evident from the context, that he was to be the deliverer of the Jews from the hands of the king of Assyria, and was to be distinguished by the excellence of his administration and the respect in which he was to be held by all the nations. Making allowance for the hyperbolical style of Eastern nations, nothing can more aptly apply as prophecy than these passages do to the reign of Hezekiah, as described in the above extracts from *Kings* and *Chronicles*. But what, it may be asked, had the birth of Christ to do with the destruction of the king of Assyria? or how could it be said that before he " knew to refuse the evil and choose the good," the land of Syria and of Israel should be deserted of their respective kings Rezin and Pekah, who were gathered to their fathers many years before his birth?

Digitized by Google

This illustrious son of Ahaz was not the only king among the select nation of God, that was honoured with such names as Hezekiah or "God my strength," and "Emmanuel" or "God with us;" and also with such epithets as "Wonderful, Counsellor, or Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, and the Prince of Peace." We find several other chiefs of that tribe that used to walk in the way of God, dignified in Scripture with epithets of a similar import. *Genesis* xxxii. 28: "And he said, Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel, (Prince of God:) for as a prince hast thou power with God and with men, and hast prevailed." *Psalm* lxxxix. 18: "For the Lord is our defence; and THE HOLY ONE of Israel is our king. 19, Then thou spakest in vision to *thy Holy One*, and saidst, I have laid help upon one that is *mighty*: I have exalted one chosen out of the people. 20, I have found David my servant; with my holy oil have I *anointed* him: 27, Also I will make him MY FIRST BORN, higher than the kings of the *earth*."

As to the word "a virgin," found in the English translation, I request my readers to advert to the original Hebrew העלמה "the virgin," as well as to the Greek both of the Septuagint and the Gospel of *Matthew*, ἡ παρθένος "the virgin," leaving it to them to judge, whether a translation which so entirely perverts the meaning preserved throughout, by men whom we cannot suspect of ignorance of the original language, must not have proceeded from a previous determination to apply the term "virgin," as found in the Prophet, to the mother of Christ, in order that the high titles applied to Hezekiah might in the most unqualified manner be understood of Jesus.

The Evangelist Matthew referred in his Gospel to *Isaiah* vii. 14, merely for the purpose of accommodation;

Digitized by Google

the Son of Ahaz and the Saviour resembling each other, in each being the means, at different periods, though in different senses, of establishing the throne of the house of David. In the same manner he referred to *Hosea* xi. 1, in ch. ii. 15. of his Gospel, and in many other instances. How inconsistent is it that a sect, which maintains the omniscience and omnipotence of Jesus, should apply to him a passage, by which he is made subject to such a degree of ignorance, as not to be able at one period to distinguish between good and evil. (*Isaiah* vii. 16 : "For before the child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good," &c.) Admitting that these quotations in *Isaiah* were originally applicable to Jesus, they cannot assist in proving the Deity of the Messiah ; just as they fall short of proving the divinity of Hezekiah when applied to him : —for we find in the sacred writings the name of God, and even the term of Jehovah, the peculiar name of God, applied as an appellation to others, without establishing any argument for asserting the Deity of those to whom such names are given. *Jeremiah* xxxiii. 16 : "In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely : and this is the name wherewith she shall be called, JEHOVAH OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS." In the English version, the word Jehovah is rendered "Lord," in this and in other passages. *Exodus* xvii. 15 : "And Moses built an altar, and called the name of it Jehovah-nissi, or 'JEHOVAH MY BANNER.'" It is fortunate that some sect has not hitherto arisen, maintaining the Deity of Jerusalem, or of the altar of Moses, from the authority of the passages just mentioned.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews, ch. i. 8, 9, reference is made to *Psalm* xlv. 6, 7, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever, &c. Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest

Digitized by Google

wickedness: therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee," &c. I have frequently noticed that the term "God" in an inferior sense is often applied in the Scriptures to the Messiah and other distinguished persons; but it deserves particularly to be noticed in this instance, that the Messiah, in whatever sense he is declared God, is in the very same sense described in ch. v. 6, ("God thy God") as *having a God superior to him*, and by whom he *was appointed* to the office of Messiah.

Supposed application of the term "Jehovah" to Jesus in references made to the Old Testament.

Luke i. 16, 18: "And many of the children of Israel shall he (John the Baptist) turn to the Lord their God. And he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just; to make ready a people prepared for the Lord"—compared with *Isaiah* xl. 3, "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of Jehovah, make straight in the desert a highway for our God:" and also in *Malachi* iii. 1, "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith Jehovah of hosts." From this, it is concluded by Trinitarians, that because the Prophet John is described as the forerunner of Jehovah, and in the evangelist as the forerunner of Jesus, therefore Jesus must be Jehovah.

In reply to this, it may be simply observed, that we find in the Prophet distinct and separate mention of Jehovah and of the Messiah as the messenger of the covenant;

Digitized by Google

John therefore ought to be considered as the forerunner of both, in the same manner as a commander sent in advance to occupy a strong post in the country of the enemy, may be said to be preparing the way for the battles of his king, or of the general whom the king places at the head of his army.

They also refer to *Isaiah* vi. 5, "For mine eyes have seen the king, the Lord of hosts"—comparing it with *John* xii. 41, "These things said Isaiah, when he saw his glory, and spake of him." The passage in the evangelist is more correctly explained by referring to *John* viii. 56, "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day;" which cannot be understood of ocular vision, but prophetic anticipation; whereas the glory seen in the vision of Isaiah was that of God himself in the delivery of the commands given to the Prophet on that occasion.

Corinthians i. 30, "But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness," &c. is compared with *Jeremiah* xxiii. 6, "He shall be called Jehovah our righteousness." In reply to which I only refer my reader again to the passage in *Jeremiah* xxxiii. 16, in which Jerusalem also is called "Jehovah our righteousness," and to the phrase "*is made unto us of God*" found in the passage in question, and expressing the inferiority of Jesus to God. Also 2 *Cor.* v. 21, "That we might be made the righteousness of God in him," where St. Paul says, that all Christians may be made the righteousness of God.

Mr. Brown, a celebrated Trinitarian Commentator, retains the common version of *Jeremiah* xxiii. 6, and applies it to Jesus, whom he supposes to be "Jehovah our righteousness." But in ch. xxxiii. 16, where the construction in the original Hebrew is precisely the same, he

Digitized by Google

alters the version, and thus renders it in the margin, "he who shall call her is Jehovah our righteousness," instead of applying the phrase "Jehovah our righteousness" to Jerusalem, in the same manner as he had applied it to Jesus in the former passage.—I therefore deem it necessary to give the original Hebrew of both texts, and a verbal translation of them. The reader will judge how strongly the judgment of the learned Commentator was biassed in support of a favourite doctrine. *Jer.* xxiii. 6, בימיו תושע יהודה וישראל ישכן לבטח וזה שמו אשר יקראו יהוה צדקנו "In his days shall be saved Judah, and Israel shall dwell in safety, and this his name which (man) shall call him, Jehovah our righteousness." *Jer.* xxxiii. 16, בימים ההם תושע יהודה וירושלם תשכון לבטח וזה אשר יקרא לה יהוה צדקנו "In those days shall be saved Judah, and Jerusalem shall dwell in safety, and this (name) which (man) shall call her, Jehovah our righteousness."

In altering the common translation of the latter passage, Mr. Brown first disregards the stop after יקרא לה that is, "shall call her;" which by separating the two parts of the sentence, prevents Jehovah from being employed as the agent of the verb "shall call." 2ndly, He entirely neglects the established mode of construction, by leaving זה or "this," untranslated, and by omitting to point out the name by which Jerusalem should be called. 3dly, He totally overlooks the idiom of the Hebrew, in which verbs are often employed unaccompanied with their agent, when no specific agent is intended, as appears from the following passages:—

Gen. xxv. 26, ואחרי כן וצא [יצא] אחיו וידו אחזת בעקב עשו ויקרא שמו יעקב "And after that came his brother out, and his hand took hold on Esau's heel, and (man) called his

name Jacob." 2 *Samuel* ii. 16, ויחזקו איש בראש רעהו וחרבו בצד רעהו ויפלו יחדו ויקרא למקום ההוא חלקת הצרים אשר בגבעון "And they caught every one his fellow by the head, and thrust his sword in his fellow's side; so they fell down together: wherefore (man) called that place Helkath Hazurem, which is in Gibeon." *Genesis* xvi. 14, על כן קרא לבאר באר לחי ראי "Wherefore (man) called the well Beer-lahai-roi."

They again adduce *Isaiah* xiv. 23, "Unto me (God) every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear"—compered with *Romans* xiv. 10, 12, "But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? For we all shall stand before the judgment-seat of Christ. For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God." Between the Prophet and the Apostle there is a perfect agreement in substance, since both declare that it is to God that every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall confess, through him before whose judgment-seat we shall all stand:—for at the same time both Jesus and his Apostles inform us, that we must stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, because the Father has committed the office of final judgment to him.—From this passage, they say, it appears that Jesus swore by himself, and that thereby he is proved to be God, according to the rule, that it is God only that can swear by himself. But how can they escape the context, which expressly informs us, that "the Lord" (Jehovah,) and not Jesus, swore in this manner? We must not however overlook what the Apostle says in his epistle to the *Philippians*, ch. ii. 9—11, where he declares, that at the name of Jesus every knee shall

Digitized by Google

bow and every tongue shall confess; but neither must we forget, that Jesus is declared to have been exalted to these honours by God, and that the only confession required is that he is Lord, which office confession of his dignity is to the glory of God the Father. 9, "Wherefore God also hath highly *exalted* him, and *given* him a name which is above every name; 10, That at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; 11, And that every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

Some have adopted a most extraordinary way of establishing the deity of Jesus. Any epithet or act, however common it may be, ascribed to God in the Sacred Writings, and also to Christ in the New Testament, is adduced by them as a proof of his deity; and I observe with the utmost surprise, that the prejudice of many Christians in favour of the doctrine of the Trinity induces them to lay stress upon such sophisms. For instance, *Isaiah* xliii. 3, "For I am the Lord thy God, the Holy one of Israel, thy Saviour," compared with 2 *Peter* iii. 18, "Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." The conclusion they draw from these passages is, that unless Jesus were God, he could not be a Saviour: but how futile this reasoning is will clearly appear from the following passages: *Nehemiah* ix. 27, "Thou gavest them saviours, who saved them." *Obad.* 27, "And saviours shall come up on Mount Zion." 2 *Kings* xiii. 5, "And the Lord gave Israel a Saviour, so they went out from under the hand of the Syrians: and the children of Israel dwelt in their tents, as beforetime." *Isaiah* xix. 19, 20, "In that day shall there be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar at the border thereof to the Lord. And it shall be for a sign

Digitized by Google

and for a witness unto the Lord of Hosts in the land of Egypt: for they shall cry unto the Lord because of the oppressors, and he shall send them a saviour, and a great one, and he shall deliver them." If this argument possesses any force, then it would lead us to acknowledge the deity not only of Jesus, but that of those different individuals to whom the term "Saviours" or "Saviour" is applied in the above citations. The phrase in *Isaiah*, "Besides me there is no Saviour," is easily accounted for by considering, that all those who have been instrumental in effecting the deliverance of their fellow creatures from evils of whatever nature, were dependent themselves upon God, and only instruments in his hands; and thus all appearance of inconsistence is removed.

Again, *Ps.* xxiii. 1, "Jehovah is my Shepherd"—compared with *John* x. 16, "And other sheep I have, which are not of [this] fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold, and one Shepherd." In the former text, David declared God to be his shepherd or protector; in the latter, Jesus represents himself as the one shepherd of the one fold of Christians, some of whom were already attached to him, and others were afterwards to become converts: but Trinitarian writers thus conclude from these passages: if Christ be not one with Jehovah, he could not be called a Shepherd, and thus there would be two shepherds: but a little reflection on the following passages will convince every unbiassed person, that Moses is called a shepherd in like manner, and his followers a flock; and that the term "Shepherd" is applied to others also, without conveying the idea of their unity with Jehovah. *Isaiah* lxiii. 11, "Then he remembered the days of old, Moses and his people, saying, Where is he that brought them up out of

Digitized by Google

the sea with the shepherd of his flock ?" *Ezekiel* xxxiv. 23, 24, "And *I will set up one shepherd* over them, and he shall feed them, even *my servant* David ; he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd. And I the Lord will be their God, and my *servant David* a prince among them. I the Lord have spoken it." If they insist (though without any ground) upon interpreting the name David as put for Jesus, they must still attribute his shepherdship over his flock to divine commission, and must relinquish the idea of unity between God the employer, and the Messiah his *servant*. *Jeremiah* xxiii. 4, "I will set up shepherds over them, which shall feed them : and they shall fear no more, nor be dismayed, neither shall they be lacking, saith the Lord."

Psalm lxxviii. 56, "They tempted and provoked the most high God."—compared with [1] *Cor.* x. 9, "Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted." They thus conclude : the former passage declares the most high God to have been tempted by rebellious Israelites, and in the latter, Jesus is represented to have been the person tempted by some of them, consequently Jesus is the most high God. How far cannot prejudice lead astray men of sense ! Is it not an insult to reason, to infer the deity of Jesus from the circumstance of his being in common with God, tempted by Israel and others ? Are we not all, in common with Jesus, liable to be tempted both by men and by Satan ? *Hebrews* iv. 15, "For we have not an high priest who cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities ; but was in all points *tempted like as we are*, yet without sin." *Genesis* xxii. 1, "And it came to pass after these things, that God did tempt Abraham." Can the liability to temptation common to God, to Jesus, to Abraham, and to all mankind, be of any

Digitized by Google

avail to prove the divinity and unity of these respective subjects of temptation?

We find Moses in common with God is spoken against by the rebellious Israelites. *Numb.* xxi. 5, "And the people (Israel) spoke against God, and against Moses." Are we to conclude upon this ground, that [because] God as well as Moses is declared to have been spoken against by Israel, that Moses therefore is God himself? In the same text quoted by them, we find the most high God provoked also—(they tempted and provoked the most high God)—so we find Moses and David provoked at different times. *Numbers* xxi. 1, "And Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David;" and *Psalm* cvi. 32, 33, "It went ill with Moses for their sakes: because they provoked his spirit, so that he spake unadvisedly with his lips." Can any one from the circumstance of Moses and David having been the subjects of provocation, in common with God, be justified in attempting to prove the deity of either of them?

Ps. [*Isaiah*] liv. 5, "Thy Maker is thine husband, the Lord of hosts in his name"—compared with *John* iii. 29, "He that hath the bride is the bridegroom," &c. [*Eph.*] v. 23, "For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the Church," &c. From these they infer, that as the Church is one bride, so on the other hand, there is one husband, who is termed in one place God, and in another place Christ. My readers will be pleased to examine the language employed in these two instances: in the one, God is represented as the husband of all his creatures, and in the other, Christ is declared to be the husband or the head of his followers; there is, therefore, an inequality of authority evidently ascribed to God and to Jesus. Moreover, Christ himself shows the

Digitized by Google

relation that existed between him and his Church, and himself and God, in *John* xv. 1, "I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman"—[5,] "I am the vine, ye are the branches." Would it not be highly unreasonable to set at defiance the distinction drawn by Jesus between God, himself, and his Church, and to attempt a conclusion directly contrary to his authority, and unsupported by revelation?

Revelation xxii. 13, "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last"—compared with *Isaiah* xliv. 6, "Thus saith the Lord the King of Israel, and his redeemer the Lord of hosts; I am the first, and I am the last; and besides me there is no God." From a comparison of these verses they conclude, that there is no God besides him who is the first and the last; but Jesus is the first and the last; therefore besides Jesus there is no other God. I must embrace this opportunity of laying before my readers the context of the verse in Revelation, which will, I presume, show to every unbiased mind how the verse in question has been misapplied; since the verse cited in defence of the deity of Jesus, when considered in relation to the passages that precede and follow it, most clearly declares his inferiority and his distinct nature from the Father. *Revelation* xxii. 6, "And he (the angel) said unto me, These sayings are faithful and true: and the Lord God of the holy prophets sent his angel to show unto his servants the things which must shortly be done. 7, Behold, I come quickly: blessed is he that keepeth the sayings of the prophecy of this book. 8, And I John saw these things and heard them. And when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel who showed me these things. 9, Then saith he unto me, See thou do it not: for I am thy fellow servant, and of

Digitized by Google

thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book : worship God. 10, And he saith unto me, Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book : for the time is at hand. 11, He that is unjust, let him be unjust still : and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still : and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still : and he that is holy, let him be holy still. 12, And, behold, I come quickly ; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be. 13, I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last. 14, Blessed are they that do *his* commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city. 15, For without are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie. 16, I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright morning star."

If they ascribe verse 13, (" I am Alpha and Omega," &c.,) to Jesus, and not to the angel mentioned in the above passage, they must also unavoidably ascribe to Jesus the passage coming immediately before or after it, including of course verse the 9th, " Then saith he unto me, See thou do it not : for I am thy fellow-servant," &c., for there is but one agent described by the pronoun " *He*" in the whole train of the verses above quoted, who is pointed out clearly by the repetition of the phrase, " Behold I come quickly," in verses 7th and 12th. In this case the passage, although it speaks of Jesus as Alpha and Omega, &c., yet must be considered as denying him the divine nature, and ranking him among the chosen servants of God, (" For I am thy fellow-servent.") If they ascribe all the verses of chap. xxii. as far as verse the 16th, to the

Digitized by Google

angel, they cannot justify themselves in founding their conclusion with regard to the deity of Jesus upon the force of verse the 13th, "I am Alpha and Omega," &c., which in the latter case can bear no relation to Christ, since their system requires them to apply it to an inferior angel. I beg the attention of my readers to five particular circumstances in this instance. 1st, That the angel whom the Lord sent, as intimated in verse the 6th, was intended to show his servants in general things that would shortly happen; and the angel sent by Jesus, as found in verse 19th, was to testify to John and other disciples the things relating to the churches. 2dly, Jesus declares in verse 16th, and in the subsequent verses, that he is the offspring of David, and that it is God that has the power of punishing any one who either takes away from or adds any thing to his revelation. 3dly, That the passage in *Revelation* xxii. 13, is not parallel to that contained in the prophecy of *Isaiah* xliv. 6, since the phrase "*Besides me there is no God*," which is found in the latter, and upon which the whole controversy turns, is not contained in the former. 4thly, That when the angel rejected the worship of John addressed to himself, he ordered him to worship God, without mentioning the name either jointly or separately of the Lamb, by which Jesus is distinguished throughout the Revelation:—"Worship God," ver. 9. 5thly, in the very next verse, after the speaker, whether Jesus or an angel, describes himself as Alpha and Omega, he uses the expression, "Blessed are they that do *his* commandments," clearly indicating the existence of another being to whose *commandments* obedience is required.

It is worth noticing here, that the terms, "Alpha and Omega, beginning and end," are in a finite sense justly

Digitized by Google

applicable to Jesus as the first of all created existences, and the last of those who will be required to resign the authority with which he is invested by the Father. See *Colossians* i. 15, "The first-born of every creature;" 1 *Corinthians* xv. 28, "Then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him."

Isaiah xl. 10, "Behold, the Lord God will come with a strong hand, and his arm shall rule for him: behold, his reward is with him, and his work before him"—is compared with *Revelation* xxii. 12, "I come quickly; and my reward is with me." From the circumstance of the common application of the phrase, "his reward is with him," to God and to Jesus, they infer the deity of the latter; in answer to which I beg to refer my readers to the foregoing paragraphs illustrating verse 11th, which immediately precedes the verse in question of the *Revelation*, and also to *John* v. 30, 22, "As I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father who hath sent me. The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son;" and to *Matthew* xvi. 27, "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works." Do not these passages point out evidently, that the power of exercising judgment and of distributing rewards *has been given* to Jesus by the Almighty, and that Jesus possesses this authority in behalf of the *Father* of the universe?

Ephesians iv. 8, "When he (Christ) ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men"—compared with *Psalm* lxviii. 18, "Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: thou hast received gifts for men, yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord

Digitized by Google

God might dwell among them." The Jews are of opinion that David in this verse spoke of Moses, who when he ascended to Mount Sinai, received gifts (i. e. the divine commandments) for men, even for the rebellious Israelites; in this case the Apostle Paul in his epistle, must have applied the verse in an accommodated sense to Jesus. The verse in the Psalm may be directly applied to Jesus, who, on his ascension, received gifts of pardon even for those who had rebelled against him. Mr. Brown, a celebrated Trinitarian Commentator, and several others, consider the 18th verse in this *Psalm*, and verse 8th in this chapter of *Ephesians*, as immediately applicable to Jesus as the Messiah. But another writer, Mr. Jones, with a view to establish the deity of Christ by a comparison of *Ephesians* iv. 8, with *Psalm* lxviii. 18, omits carefully the latter part of the verse, ("Thou hast received gifts for men, yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them,") which is altogether inapplicable to God, and quotes only the first part of the verse, ("thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive;") and thence draws this conclusion—"The Scripture here (in the Epistle referred to) expressly affirms the person who ascends, &c. to be the Lord God." From a view of the whole verse, the sense must, according to this mode of reasoning, be as follows—"The person who ascended on high, and who *received* gifts for men, *that the Lord God* might dwell among them, is the Lord God;" an interpretation, which as implying that the Lord God ascended and received gifts from a Being of course superior to himself, in order that he might dwell among men, is equally absurd and unscriptural.

Zechariah xii. 10, as found in the English Version, "In

Digitized by Google

that day they shall look upon me whom they have pierced"—compared with *John* xix. 37, "They shall look on him whom they pierced;" from which comparison he has thus concluded—"As it stands in the Prophet, the Lord Jehovah was to be pierced; so that unless the man Christ who hung upon the cross was also the Lord Jehovah, the Evangelist is found to be a false witness, in applying to him a prophecy that could not possibly be fulfilled in him." In order to show the source of Mr. Jones's error, I beg to lay before my readers the verse in Hebrew, and a correct translation into English.

ושפכתי על בית דויד ועל יושב ירושלם רוח חן ותחנונים והביטו אלי
את אשר דקרו וספדו עליו כמספד על היחיד והמר עליו כהמר על הבכור

"And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplication: and they shall look *toward me on account of him whom* they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him as one mourneth for his own son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his first-born." This translation is strongly confirmed by the Septuagint, whose words I subjoin with a literal rendering—

Καὶ ἐπιβλέψονται πρός με, ἀνθ' ὧν κατωρχήσαντο.

"And they shall look *towards me*, on *account* of those whom they pierced."

In the Prophet the Lord speaks of Israel at the approach of their restoration, when they will look up to God for mercy on account of their cruelty to the Messiah, whom they pierced, and for whom they will mourn and lament.

Hence the prophecy in question has been fulfilled in Jesus, without representing the Lord (Jehovah) as the object pierced; and consequently no false testimony is chargeable upon John the Evangelist, who, by changing the object of the verse from " me" found in the Hebrew and Septuagint, into ' him," we may suppose had in view the general import rather than the particular expressions of the prophecy, pointing out that they looked to the Messiah also, whom they had pierced. Without referring to the Hebrew phrase, which shows beyond doubt the inaccuracy of the English translation of the verse, common sense is, I presume, sufficient to show, that since in the last two clauses in the verse under consideration the Lord God speaks of the Messiah in the third person—(" for him they (i. e. the Israelites) will mourn and lament,") he must be supposed to have spoken of the same third person as pierced by them unjustly, and thus to have pointed out the cause of their lamentation. If Jehovah had been pierced, he would have been mentioned throughout in the first person, also as the object of lamentation and bitterness.

1 *Peter* ii. 6, " Wherefore is it also contained in the Scripture, Behold, *I lay in Zion* a chief corner-stone, elect, precious: and he that believeth on him shall not be confounded. 7, Unto you therefore which believe he is precious: but unto them who are disobedient, the stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner, 8, And a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence, even to them which stumble at the word, being disobedient; whereunto also they were appointed"—compared with *Isaiah* xxviii. 16, " Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, *I lay in Zion* for a foundation, a

Digitized by Google

stone, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone, a sure foundation; he that believeth shall not make haste;" and *Isaiah* viii. 13, "Sanctify the Lord of hosts himself; let him be your fear, and let him be your dread. 14, And he shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling, and for a rock of offence, to both the houses of Israel; for a gin and for a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem."

These passages show, that the Lord God placed the Messiah as a corner-stone for the temple, and that whoever stumbles at that stone so exalted by the Almighty, stumbles at or disobeys him who has thus placed it. But Mr. Jones omits the words found in, *Peter* ii. 6, and *Isaiah* xxviii. 16, "I lay in Zion a chief corner-stone, precious," &c. which show the created nature of the Messiah, and after quoting a part of vers. 7 and 8 of 1 *Peter*, ch. ii. ("The stone which the builder disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner, and a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence,") and only verse 13th and part of the 14th of ch. viii. of *Isaiah*, he has thus concluded:—"This stone of stumbling and rock of offence, as it appears from the latter text, (the text in *Peter*,) is no other than Christ, the same stone which the builders rejected. Therefore Christ is the Lord of hosts himself." —Here the Apostle *Peter*, in conformity with the Prophet, represents God as the founder of the corner-stone, and Jesus as the same corner-stone, which, though it be disallowed by the Jews, yet is *made* by the same founder, the head of the corner; but the Jews from their disobedience stumbled directly at the stone so exalted, rendering it a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence; and hereby they stumbled secondarily at the founder of this stone, and offended the Lord God; who, though he was the rock of

Digitized by Google

defence of Israel, (rock of refuge, *Psalm* xciv. 24,) became a stone of stumbling and [a] rock of offence.

Thus in *Luke* x. 16, Jesus declares to his disciples, "He that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me;" intimating by these words, that contempt for the holy doctrines which Christ commissioned his disciples to teach, argued contempt for him by whom Christ himself was sent; but no one will thence infer the deity of those disciples. In vers. 6 and 7 in question, and in ver. 4 of the same chapter of *Peter*, ("To whom coming as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God and precious,") Jesus is distinctly declared to be "*a* stone of stumbling," "*a* living stone chosen of God;" the indefinite article "a" here denoting that he is only one of many such stones. It is surprising that Mr. Jones could overlook these phrases, and conclude upon the identity of Jesus with God from metaphorical language, which represents God as "a stumbling stone" of Israel, and Jesus a stumbling stone of those who never believed him. That there is nothing peculiar in Jesus being called a stone or a shepherd, see *Genesis* xlix. 24, where in a metaphorical sense Joseph is called "the shepherd and the stone of Israel."

The Hebrew language, in common with other Asiatic tongues, frequently indulges in metaphor; and consequently the Old Testament, written in that language, abounds with expressions which cannot be taken in their literal sense. This indeed Jesus himself points out in *John* x. 34—36, in which he justifies the assumption of the title of Son of God, to denote that he was sanctified and sent of the Father, by showing that in the Scriptures the name even of God was sometimes metaphorically applied to men of power or exalted rank. Hence we find

Digitized by Google

epithets which in their strict sense in their most common application are peculiar to God, applied to inferior beings, as I have already noticed. But the Scripture avoids affording the least pretext of misunderstanding the real nature of such objects, by various adjuncts and epithets of obvious meaning, quite inapplicable to the Deity. It is melancholy, however, to o serve, how frequently men overlook the idiom of the language of Scripture, and (apparently misled by the force of preconceived notions) set aside every expression that modifies those that suit their peculiar ideas.

Were we to admit common phrases applied both to God and to Jesus as a proof of the divinity of the latter, we must upon the same ground be led to acknowledge the deity of Moses, of David, and of other Prophets, who are in common with God the subjects of peculiar phrases. Moses in *Deut.* xxx. 15, declares, "See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil." So Jehovah declares in *Jeremiah* xxi. 8, "Behold, I set before you the way of life, and the way of death." In conformity to this mode of argument adopted by Trinitarian writers, we should thus conclude from these passages—unless Moses were one with Jehovah, he could not in his own name employ the same authoritative phrase which is used by Jehovah. In the same manner the term worship is equally applied to God and David in *Chronicles* xxix. 20, "And David said to all the congregation, Now bless the Lord your God. And all the congregation blessed the Lord God of their fathers, and bowed down their heads, and worshipped the Lord and the king." Whence, according to their mode of argument, every one must find himself justified in drawing the following conclusion: God is the only object of worship—but the term worship

is in the Bible applied to David—David must therefore be acknowledged as God.

I have now noticed all the arguments founded on Scripture that I have heard of as advanced in support of the doctrine of the Trinity, except such as appeared to me so futile as to be unworthy of remark; and in the course of my examination have plainly stated the grounds on which I conceive them to be inadmissible. Perhaps my opinions may subject me to the severe censure of those who dissent from me, and some will be ready to discover particular motives for my presuming to differ from the great majority of Christian teachers of the present day in my view of Christianity, with the doctrines of which I have become but recently acquainted.—Personal interest can hardly be alleged as likely to have actuated me, and therefore the love of distinction or notoriety may perhaps be resorted to, to account for conduct which they wish it to be believed honest conviction could never direct. In reply to such an accusation, I can only protest in the most solemn manner, that even in the belief that I have been successful in combating the doctrine of Trinitarians, I cannot assume to myself the smallest merit:—for what credit can be gained in proving that one is not three, and that the same being cannot be at once man and God; or in opposing those who maintain, that all who do not admit doctrines so incomprehensible must be therefore subjected by the All-merciful to eternal punishment? It is too true to be denied, that we are led by the force of the senses to believe many things that we cannot fully understand. But where the evidence of sense does not compel us, how can we believe what is not only beyond our comprehension, but contrary to it and to the common course of nature, and directly against revelation; which declares positively the unity of

Digitized by Google

God as well as his incomprehensibility; but no where ascribes to him any number of persons, or any portion of magnitude? *Job* xxxvi. 26, "Behold God is great, and we know him not." Ch. xxxvii. 23, "Touching the Almighty, we cannot find him out." *Psalm* cxlv. 3, "His greatness is unsearchable." Neither are my attempts owing to a strong hope of removing early impressions from the breasts of those, whose education instilled certain ideas into their minds from the moment they became capable of receiving them; for notwithstanding great and long-continued exertions on my part to do away Hindoo polytheism, though palpably gross and absurd, my success has been very partial. This experience, therefore, it may be suggested, ought to have been sufficient to discourage me from any other attempt of the kind; but it is my reverence for Christianity, and for the author of this religion, that has induced me to endeavour to vindicate it from the charge of Polytheism as far as my limited capacity and knowledge extend. It is indeed mortifying to my feelings to find a religion, that from its sublime doctrines and pure morality should be respected above all other systems, reduced almost to a level with Hindoo theology, merely by human creeds and prejudices; and from this cause brought to a comparison with the Paganism of ancient Greece; which, while it included a plurality of Gods, yet maintained that Θεὸς ἐστὶ εἷς, or "God is one," and that their numerous divine *persons* were all comprehended in that one Deity.

Having derived my own opinions on this subject entirely from the Scriptures themselves, I may perhaps be excused for the confidence with which I maintain them against those of so great a majority, who appeal to the same authority for theirs; inasmuch as I attribute the

Digitized by Google

different views, not to any inferiority of judgment compared with my own limited ability, but to the powerful effects of early religious impressions; for when these are deep, reason is seldom allowed its natural scope in examining them to the bottom. Were it a practice among Christians to study first the books of the Old Testament as found arranged in order, and to acquire a knowledge of the true force of scriptural phrases and expressions without attending to interpretations given by any sect; and then to study the New Testament, comparing the one with the other, Christianity would not any longer be liable to be encroached upon by human opinions.

I have often observed that English divines, when arguing with those that think freely on religion, quote the names of Locke and Newton as defenders of Christianity; but they totally forget that the Christianity which those illustrious persons professed, did not contain the doctrine of the Trinity, which our divines esteem as the fundamental principle of this religion. For the conviction of the public as to the accuracy of this assertion, I beg to be allowed to extract here a few lines of their respective works, referring my readers to their publications upon religion for more complete information.

Locke's Works, Vol. VII. p. 421: "But that neither he nor others may mistake my book, this is that in short which it says—1st, That there is a faith that makes men Christians—2dly. That this faith is the believing 'Jesus of Nazareth to be the Messiah'—3dly, That the believing Jesus to be the Messiah, includes in it a receiving him for our Lord and King, promised and sent from God, and so lays upon all his subjects an absolute and indispensable necessity of assenting to all that they can attain of the

Digitized by Google

knowledge that he taught, and of sincere obedience to all that he commanded."

Sir I. Newton's Observations upon the Prophecies, p. 262: "The Beasts and Elders therefore represent the Christians of all nations; and the worship of these Christians in their churches is here represented under the form of worshipping God and the Lamb in the Temple, God for his benefaction in creating all things, and the Lamb for his benefaction in redeeming us with his blood:—God as sitting upon the throne and living for ever, and the Lamb exalted above all by the merits of his death."

It cannot be alleged that these personages, in imitation of several Grecian philosophers, published these sentiments only in conformity to the vulgar opinion, and to the established religion of their country; for both the vulgar opinion and the religion of the government of England in their days were directly opposite to the opinions which these celebrated men entertained.

The mention of the name of Sir Isaac Newton, one of the greatest mathematicians (if not the greatest) that ever existed, has brought into my recollection a mathematical argument which I some time ago heard a divine adduce in support of the Trinity, and which I feel inclined to consider here, though I am afraid some of my readers may censure me for repeating an argument of this kind. It is as follows: that as three lines compose one triangle, so three persons compose one Deity. It is astonishing that a mind so conversant with mathematical truth as was that of Sir Isaac Newton, did not discover this argument in favour of the possible existence of a Trinity, brought to light by Trinitarians, considering that it must have lain so much in his way. If it did occur to him, its force may

Digitized by Google

possibly have given way to some such considerations as the following:—This analogy between the Godhead and a triangle, in the first instance, denies to God, equally with a line, any real existence: for extension of all kinds, abstracted from position or relative situation, exists only in idea. Secondly, it destroys the unity which they attempt to establish between Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; for the three sides of a triangle are conceived of as separate existences. Thirdly, it denies to each of the three persons of God, the epithet "God," inasmuch as each side cannot be designated a triangle; though the Father of the universe is invariably called God in the strict sense of the term. Fourthly, it will afford to that sect among the Hindoos who suppose God to consist of four persons, an opportunity of using the same mode of arguing, to show the reasonableness of their sentiments, by comparing the compound Deity with the four sides of a quadrilateral figure. Fifthly, this manner of arguing may be esteemed better adapted to support the Polytheism of the majority of Hindoos, who believe in numerous persons under one Godhead; for instead of comparing the Godhead with a triangle, a figure containing the fewest sides, and thereby proving the three persons of the Godhead, they might compare God with a polygon, more suitable to the dignified rank of the Deity, and thus establish the consistency with reason, of the belief, that the Godhead may be composed of numerous persons. Sixthly, this mode of illustration would, in fact, equally suit the Atheist as the Polytheist. For, as the Trinity is represented by the three sides of a triangle, so the eternal revolution of nature without any divine person may be compared to the circle, which is considered as having no sides nor angles; or, Seventhly, as some great mathematicians consider the circle as a poly-

Digitized by Google

gon, having an infinite number of sides, the illustration of the Trinitarian doctrine by the form of the triangle will by analogy justify those sects, who maintain the existence of an infinite number of persons in the Godhead, in referring for an illustration of their opinions to the circular, or rather perhaps to the globular figure, in which is to be found an infinity of circles, formed each of an infinite number of sides.

As I was concluding this Appendix, a friend to the doctrine of the Trinity kindly lent me Serle's "Horæ Solitariæ." I confine here my attention only to four or five arguments, which the author has adduced in the beginning of his work, and that for several reasons. 1st, Because a deliberate attention to the nature of the first-mentioned arguments may furnish the reader with a general idea of the rest, and justify me in neglecting them. 2ndly, Because such of the others as seem to me at all worthy of notice have been already considered and replied to; and 3dly, Because I am unwilling to protract further discussion, which has already grown to a length far beyond my original intention.

At page 10, Mr. Serle alleges, that "God says by Moses in the book of Genesis, In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth; and then just afterwards, the Spirt moved upon the face of the waters. Here are three persons in one power; the beginning, God, and the Spirit." If a bare mention of the word "beginning" and "spirit," (or properly speaking, "wind,") in the two first verses of Genesis, justifies the numbering of them as two persons of God, how can we conscientiously omit the "water" mentioned in the same verse as coexistent with "spirit," making it the fourth person, and darkness, which is mentioned before spirit, as a fifth person of God: and if under

Digitized by Google

any pretence we are justified in classing "beginning," an abstract relation, as a person of God, how can we deny the same dignity to the "end," which is equally an abstract relation? Nay, the very words of chap. i. 8, of Revelation might be quoted to prove one of the persons of God to be the "ending:"—"I am Alpha and Omega, the BEGINNING and the ENDING, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty." We have then God, the Beginning, the Spirit, and the Ending, four persons at least whom we must admit into the Godhead, if Mr. Serle's opinion have any foundation.

Page 12, "They (the ancient Chaldee Jews and Cabalists) expressed their idea of the Trinity [*by a circle enclosing three jods, and the point kametz common to each*;] where the three jods denote Jah, Jah, Jah, or that each of three persons (according to our Athanasian Creed) is by himself Jah or Lord:—the point (kametz) as common to each, implies the divine nature in which the three persons equally existed; and the circle, inclosing all, was intended to exhibit the perfect unity, eternity, and conjunction, of the whole Trinity." This type, if it existed at any time, can bear various interpretations, Theistical, Polytheistical, or Atheistical; but in Hebrew and Chaldee, the sign which is generally used to denote the Deity has two jods only; a reference to the Targums of Jonathan and Onkelos, written in the Chaldee language, and to other Targums in Hebrew and Chaldee, will establish the fact beyond doubt. This practice, which, according to Mr. Serle's mode of arguing, establishes the duality of God, is entirely overlooked by him.

In the same page again he says, that "in a very ancient book of the Jews, the first person, or Hypostasis, is described as כתר Kather, the crown, or admirable and pro-

Digitized by Google

found intelligence; the second person חכמה Chochma, wisdom, or the intelligence illuminating the creation, and the second glory; and the third person בינה Binah, or the sanctifying intelligence, the worker of faith and the father of it." He immediately after this assertion notices in page 13, "they believed, taught, and adored three primordial existences in the Godhead, which they called sometimes מדות middoth, or *properties*, and sometimes ספירות sephiroth, or *numerations*." The force of truth here impels the author to contradict himself directly; since he at one time asserts that the Jews believed them to be the three *persons* of God, and again forgetting what he said, he affirms that the Jews called them *properties*, or *numeration* of properties. The fact is, that when the intercourse between the Jews and Greeks was great, the former, in imitation of some of the latter, entertained the idea that the Supreme Deity used ten superior intelligences or qualities in the creation of the world; namely, כתר Crown—חכמה Wisdom—בינה Understanding—גדלה Greatness—גבורה Mightiness—תפארת Beauty—נצח Everlasting—הוד Glory—יסוד Foundation—מלכות Kingdom.* But a Godhead consisting of ten persons not suiting Mr. Serle's hypothesis, he omits the seven last, and mentions only the three first, which he denominates a proof of the Trinity.

In page 14, Mr. Serle represents "R. Simeon and the famous Jonathan treating upon the Trisagion, or thrice holy, in the 6th chapter of *Isaiah*," as saying, "that the first Holy implies the Father, the second Holy the Son, and the third Holy the Holy Ghost." I therefore give the

* This opinion is still to be found in the conversation as well as writings of the learned amongst Eastern theologians.

Digitized by Google

commentary of Jonathan,* which I have been so fortunate as to procure, in order to show how zeal in behalf of the Trinity has sometimes led men to forget the claims of care and prudence. Jonathan's targum on the term "Holy" thrice repeated in *Isaiah* vi. 3, is as follows: קדיש בשמי מרומא עלאה בית שכנתיה קדיש על ארעא עובד גבורתיה קדיש לעלם ולעלמי עלמיא "Holy in the most high heavens, the place of his glory—Holy upon the earth, the work of his power—Holy for ever and ever and ever."

Again, in page 14, he says, that "The Jews before Christ had a title for the Godhead consisting of twelve letters, which Maimonides, the most learned of all their writers, owns to have been a compounded name, or name (as was common among the Rabbins) composed of the initial letters of the names. Galatinus from R. Hakkadosh, (who lived about A. D. 150, or rather from Porchetus Salvaticus, or Raymundus Martini,) believes that these twelve letters were אב בן ורוח הקדש i. e. Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

There is no impossibility in the existence of a name of God, consisting of twelve letters, as is stated to have been the case on the authority of Maimonides, because we find different names of God, consisting of various numbers of letters. But Mr. Serle, on the authority of Galatinus, a Christian writer, represents these twelve letters as expressing the names of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. I therefore make a few remarks on this head. 1st, Mr. Searle himself expresses his doubts respecting the source

* The copy which is now in my hands was printed in London, by Thomas Roycroft, in the year 1656. It contains, besides the targum of Jonathan, the original Hebrew text, together with the Septuagint, Syriac, and Arabic translations, each accompanied with a Latin interpretation.

Digitized by Google

from which Galatinus had obtained his information, "*whether from R. Hakkadosh, from Porchetus Salvaticus, or from Raymundus Martini.*" 2ndly, The construction of this sentence of twelve letters, is conformable to the European style of writing, but is quite foreign to Hebrew idiom, which requires a conjunction before בן, or Son; but the omission of this shows that it must have been invented by one more accustomed to the idiom of European languages, than to that of the Hebrew. 3rdly, Maimonides, the original anthority of Mr. Serle, owns that these twelve letters were the initials of other names; whereas Mr. Serle in the explanation of them represents them as composing in themselves three complete names, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, instead of giving a name for each of the twelve letters.

I am not aware how many arguments and illustrations of similar weight and importance to those already discussed may still remain, that have not been brought to my notice; but I trust the inquiry has proceeded sufficiently far to justify me in still adhering to the unity of God as the doctrine taught alike in the Old and in the New Testaments.

I now conclude this Appendix, with repeating my prayer, that a day may soon arrive, when religion shall not be a cause of difference between man and man, and when every one will regard the Precepts of Jesus as the sole Guide to Peace and Happiness.

Digitized by Google

P. S. Dr. Prideaux, in the fourth volume of his "Connexion," (which has very lately come into my hands,) takes a different view of Isaiah, ch. ix. vers. 6, 7, from that which has been offered in the preceding pages. After quoting the words of the prophet according to the English Version, he says, "Christians all hold that this is spoken of the Messiah; and Jonathan, in the Targum which is truly his, doth on that place say the same." Hereby he gives out that this prophecy, including the epithets "Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, and the Prince of Peace," is applied by Jonathan, as by Christians, to the Messiah:—I therefore give here the explanation given by Jonathan to verses 6 and 7, which will sufficiently show the error Dr. Prideaux has commited.

אמר נביא לבית דוד ארי רבי אתיליד לנא בר אתיהיב לנא
וקביל אוריתא עלוהי למטרא ואתקרי שמיה מן קדם תפליא עצת
אלהא גברא קים .לעלמיא משיחא דשלמא יסגי עלנא ביומוהי:
סגי רבו לעדדי אוריתא ולנטרי שלמא ליתסוף על כורסי דוד ועל
מלכותיה לאתקנא יתיה ולמבנה בדינא ובזכותא מכען ועד . עלמא
במימרא דיי צבאורת תתעבד דא:

"The prophet says, to the house of David a child is born, to us a son is given, and he will take upon himself the preservation of the law; from the presence of the causer of wonderful counsels, the great God enduring for ever, his name will be called the anointed, (in Heb. Messiah,) in whose days peace shall be multiplied upon us." "Greatness shall be multiplied to those who obey the law, and to those who keep peace, there will be no end to the throne of David and of his government: for establishing and for building it with judgment and with justice now and for ever."

Digitized by Google

Here Jonathan, in direct opposition to Christians, denies to the Son so born, the epithets "Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, and Everlasting Father;" and applies to him only the title of "the Prince of Peace," (nearly synonymous with Messiah,) on account of his preserving peace during his reign, as was promised of the Messiah. (2 Kings xx. 19, "Is it not good (says Hezekiah) if peace and truth be in my days?" 2 Chron. xxxii. 26, "The wrath of the Lord came not upon them in the days of Hezekiah.") This application of the term anointed (or Messiah) is made to Hezekiah in the same manner as to other eminent kings, often called Messiah in the Sacred Writings:—1 Samuel xxii. 3, "Behold here I am! witness against me before the Lord, and his anointed, (or his Messiah,) the king." 2 Samuel xxiii. 1, "David the son of Jesse said, and the man who was raised up on high, the Messiah of the God of Jacob," &c. Ch. xxii. 51, "He is the tower of salvation for his King, and showeth mercy to his Messiah, unto David, and to his seed for evermore." 1 Samuel ii. 10, "The Lord shall judge the ends of the earth; and he shall give strength unto his King, and exalt the horn of his Messiah." Psalm xx. 6, "Now know I that the Lord saveth his Messiah." Isaiah xlv. 1, "Thus saith the Lord to his Messiah, to Cyrus." The reign of Hezekiah was so accompanied with peace and success, that some Jewish commentators entertained the opinion that Hezekiah was really the last Messiah promised by God.

R. Hillel, אמר רבי הלל אין להם משיח לישראל שכבר אכלוהו בימי חזקיה:

"There is no Messiah for the Israelites, for they enjoyed it (i. e. they had him) at the time of Hezekiah."

Digitized by Google

If Trinitarians still insist, in defiance of the above authorities, and under pretence of the word "anointed" or "Messiah," found in the Targum of Jonathan, that his interpretation should be understood of the expected Messiah, then as far as depends upon the interpretation given by him of verses 6 and 7, they must be compelled to relinquish the idea that he expected a divine deliverer. Moreover, all other celebrated Jewish writers, some of whom are more ancient than Jonathan, apply the passage in question to Hezekiah, some of them differing however from him in the application of the epithets contained in verse 6.

Talmud Sanhedrim, ch. 11, "God said, let Hezekiah, who has five names, take vengeance upon the king of Assyria, who has taken upon himself five names also." R. Sholomo follows the annotation made by Shammai. "For a child is born, &c. Though Ahaz was wicked, his son, who was born to him to be a king in his stead, shall be righteous, the government of God and his yoke shall be on his shoulder, because he shall obey the law and keep the commandments thereof, and shall incline his shoulder to the burden of God.—And he calls his name, &c. God, who is the wonderful counsellor, and the mighty and everlasting Father, called his name the Prince of Peace, for peace and truth shall be in his days."*

*It is worth noticing, that "to be called" and "to be" do not invariably signify the same thing; since the former does not always imply that the thing is in reality what it is called, but the use of it is justified when the thing is merely *taken notice of* in that view. See Luke i. 36, "This is the sixth month with her who was called (that is reputed) barren." Isaiah lxi. 3. "That they might be called (or accounted) trees of righteousness." This is more especially the case

Digitized by Google

The reader will not suppose the application of the terms "wonderful counsellor, mighty God, everlasting Father, and prince of peace," to Hezekiah, to be unscriptural, when he refers to page 283 of this work, and considers the following passages, in which the same epithets are used for human beings, and even for inanimate objects. 2 Chron. ii. 9, "The house which I am about to build shall be wonderful great." Micah iv. 9, "Is there no king in thee? Is thy counsellor perished?" Genesis xiii. 6, "Hear us: thou art a Mighty Prince amongst us." Judges ix. 13, "Should I leave my wine which cheereth God and man?" that is, master and servant. 2 Thess. ii. 4, "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God." Gen. xlix. 26, "To the utmost bound of the everlasting hills." 1 Samuel iv. 8, "Who shall deliver us out of the hands of these mighty gods?" which Cruden interprets of the Jewish ark. Isaiah xii. 11—28; [xliii. 28,] "Therefore I have profaned the princes of the sanctuary."

I wonder how those who found their opinion respecting the Trinity on terms applied in common to God and creatures, can possibly overlook the plain meaning of the term "Son," or "Only-begotten," continually applied to the Saviour throughout the whole of the New Testament; for should we understand the term God, in its strict sense, as denoting the First Cause, (that is, a being not born nor begotten,) we must necessarily confess that the idea of God is as incompatible with the idea of the "Son," or

when the phrase "to be called" has for its subject not a person, but the *name* of a person. See Deut. xxv. 10, "And his name shall be called in Israel, *the house of him that* hath his shoe loosed." Genesis xlviii. 16, "Let my name be named on them."

Digitized by Google

"Only begotten," as entity is with non-entity; and therefore that to apply both terms to the same being will amount to the grossest solecism in language.

As to their assertion, that there are found in the Scriptures two sets of terms and phrases, one declaring the humanity of Jesus and another his deity, and that he must therefore be acknowledged to have possessed a twofold nature, human and divine, I have fully noticed it in pp. 167—169, 252, 253, pointing out such passages as contain two sets of terms and phrases applied also to Moses and even to the chiefs of Israel and to others; and that, if it is insisted upon, that each word in the Sacred Writings should be taken in its strict sense, Moses and others, equally with the Saviour, must be considered as gods, and the religion of the Jews and Christians will appear as Polytheistical as that of Heathens.

Although there is the strictest consistency between all the passages in the sacred books, Trinitarians, with a view to support their opinion, charge them first with inconsistency, and then attempt to reconcile the alleged contradiction by introducing the doctrine of the union of two natures, divine and human, in one person, forgetting that at the same time the greatest incongruity exists between the nature of God and man, according to both revelation and common sense.

If Christianity inculcated a doctrine which represents God as consisting of three persons, and appearing sometimes in the human form, at other times in a bodily shape like a dove, no Hindoo, in my humble opinion, who searches after truth, can conscientiously profess it in preference to Hindooism; for that which renders the modern Hindoo system of religion absurd and detestable, is, that it represents the divine nature, though one, as consisting

Digitized by Google

of many persons, capable of assuming different forms for the discharge of different offices. I am, however, most firmly convinced, that Christianity is entirely free from every trace of Polytheism, whether gross or refined. I therefore enjoy the approbation of my conscience in publishing the Precepts of this religion as the source of Peace and Happiness.

THE END.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

FINAL APPEAL

TO

THE CHRISTIAN PUBLIC,

IN DEFENCE OF THE

'PRECEPTS OF JESUS.'

BY

RAMMOHUN ROY.

BOSTON:
CHRISTIAN REGISTER OFFICE..........S. B. Manning, Printer.
1828.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

PREFACE.

Notwithstanding the apprehension of exciting displeasure in the breasts of many worthy men, I feel myself obliged to lay before the public at large this my self-defence, entitled "A FINAL APPEAL to the Christian Public." I however confidently hope that the liberal among them will be convinced, by a reference to the first part of this Essay and to my two former Appeals, that the necessity of self-vindication against the charge of being an "injurer of the cause of truth," has compelled me, as a warm friend of that cause, to bring forward my reasons for opposing the opinions maintained by so large a body of men highly celebrated for learning and piety; a consideration which, I trust, will induce them to regard my present labors with an eye of indulgence.

I am well aware that this difference of sentiment has already occasioned much coolness towards me in the demeanor of some whose friendship I hold very dear; and that this protracted controversy has not only prevented me from rendering my humble services to my countrymen, by various publications, which I had projected in the native languages, but has diverted my attention from all other literary pursuits for three years past. Notwithstanding these sacrifices, I feel well satisfied with my present engagements, and cannot wish that I had pursued a different course; since, whatever may be the opinion of the world, my own conscience fully approves of my past endeavors to defend what I esteem the cause of truth.

In my present vindication of the unity of the Deity, as revealed through the writings of the Old and New Testaments, I appeal not only to those who sincerely believe in the Books of Revelation, and make them the standard of their faith and practice, and who must therefore deeply feel the great impor-

Digitized by Google

tance of the Divine oracles being truly interpreted ; but I also appeal to those who, although indifferent about religion, yet devote their minds to the investigation and discovery of truth, and who will, therefore, not think it unworthy of their attention to ascertain what are the genuine doctrines of Christianity, as taught by Christ and his apostles, and how much it has been corrupted by the subsequent intermixture of the polytheistical ideas that were familiar to its Greek and Roman converts, and which have continued to disfigure it in succeeding ages. I extend my appeal yet further ; I solicit the patient attention of such individuals as are rather unfavorable to the doctrines of Christianity as generally promulgated, from finding them at variance with common sense,—that they may examine and judge whether its doctrines are really such as they are understood to be by the popular opinion, which now prevails.

I feel assured that if religious controversy be carried on, with that temper and language which are considered, by wise and pious men, as most consistent with the solemn and sacred nature of religion, and more especially with the mild spirit of Christianity, the truths of it cannot, for any length of time, be kept concealed, under the imposing veil of high-sounding expressions, calculated to astonish the imagination and rouse the passions of the people, and thereby keep alive and strengthen the preconceived notions, with which such language has in their minds been, from infancy, associated. But I regret that the method which has hitherto been observed in inquiry after religious truth, by means of large publications, necessarily issued at considerable intervals of time, is not, for several reasons, so well adapted to the speedy attainment of the proposed object, as I, and other friends of true religion, could wish. These reasons are as follows :—

1st. Many readers have not sufficient leisure or perseverance to go through a voluminous essay, that they may make up their minds and come to a settled opinion on the subject.

2dly. Those who have time at their command, and interest themselves in religious researches, finding the real point under discussion mixed up with injurious insinuations and

Digitized by Google

personalities, soon feel discouraged from proceeding further, long before they can come to a determination.

3dly. The multiplicity of arguments and various interpretations of numerous scriptural passages, that bear often no immediate relation to the subject or to each other, introduced in succession, distract and dishearten such readers as are not accustomed to Biblical studies, and interrupt their further progress.

As Christianity is happily not a subject resting on vague metaphysical speculations, but is founded upon the authority of books written in languages, which are understood and explained according to known and standing rules, I therefore propose, with a view to the more speedy and certain attainment of religious truth, to establish a monthly periodical publication, commencing from the month of April next, to be devoted to Biblical criticism, and to subject Unitarian as well as Trinitarian doctrines to the test of fair argument, if those of the latter persuasion will consent thus to submit the scriptural grounds on which their tenets concerning the Trinity are built.

For the sake of method and convenience, I propose that, beginning with the Book of Genesis, and taking all the passages in that portion of Scripture, which are thought to countenance the doctrine of the Trinity, we should examine them one by one, and publish our observations upon them; and that next month we proceed in the same manner with the Book of Exodus, and so on with all the Books of the Old and New Testaments, in their regular order.

If any one of the Missionary Gentlemen, for himself and in behalf of his fellow laborers, choose to profit by the opportunity thus afforded them, of defending and diffusing the doctrines they have undertaken to preach, I request that an Essay on the Book of Genesis, of the kind above intimated, may be sent me by the middle of the month, and if confined within reasonable limits not exceeding a dozen or sixteen pages, I hereby engage to cause it to be printed and circulated at my own charge, should the Missionary Gentlemen refuse to bestow any part of the funds, intended for the spread of Chris-

Digitized by Google

tianity, towards this object; and also that a reply (not exceeding the same number of pages) to the arguments adduced, shall be published along with it by the beginning of the ensuing month. That this new mode of controversy, by short monthly publications, may be attended with all the advantages which I, in common with other searchers after truth, expect, and of which it is capable, it will be absolutely necessary that nothing be introduced of a personal nature, or calculated to hurt the feelings of individuals—that we avoid all offensive expressions, and such arguments as have no immediate connexion with the subject, and can only serve to retard the progress of discovery; and that we never allow ourselves, for a moment, to forget that we are engaged in a solemn religious disputation.

As religion consists in a code of duties which the creature believes he owes to his Creator, and as "God is no respecter of persons, but in *every nation* he that fears him and *works righteousness* is accepted with him;" it must be considered presumptuous and unjust for one man to attempt to interfere with the religious observances of others, for which, he well knows, he is not held responsible by any law either human or divine. Notwithstanding, if mankind are brought into existence, and by nature formed to enjoy the comforts of society and the pleasures of an improved mind, they may be justified in opposing any system, religious, domestic, or political, which is inimical to the happiness of society, or calculated to debase the human intellect; bearing always in mind that we are children of ONE Father, "who is above *all*, and through *all*, and in us *all*."

Calcutta, January 30, 1823.

Digitized by Google

FINAL APPEAL.

CHAPTER I.

Introductory Remarks.

Nearly a month having elapsed after the publication of the fourth number of the quarterly series of the "Friend of India," before it happened to reach me, and other avocations and objects having subsequently engaged my attention, I have not till lately had leisure to examine the laborious essay on the doctrines of the Trinity and Atonement, at the conclusion of that Magazine, offered in refutation of my Second Appeal to the Christian Public. For the able and condensed view of the arguments in support of those doctrines, which that publication presents, I have to offer the Reviewer my best thanks, though the benefit I have derived from their perusal is limited to a corroboration of my former sentiments. I must, at the same time, beg permission to notice a few unjust insinuations in some parts of his essay; but in so doing I trust no painful emotions, neither of that salutary kind alluded to by the Editor, nor of any other, will make their appearance in my remarks.

Digitized by Google

The Rev. Editor charges me with the arrogance of taking upon myself "to teach doctrines directly opposed to those held by the mass of real Christians in every age." To vindicate myself from the presumption with which I am here charged, and to shew by what necessity I have been driven to the publication of opinions unacceptable to many esteemed characters, I beg to call the attention of the public to the language of the Introduction to the "Precepts of Jesus," compiled by me, and which was my first publication connected with Christianity. They may observe therein, that, so far from teaching any "opposite doctrines," or "rejecting the prevailing opinion held by the great body of Christians," I took every precaution against giving the least offence to the prejudices of any one, and consequently limited my labor to what I supposed best calculated for the improvement of those whose received opinions are widely different from those of Christians. My words are—"I decline entering into any discussions on those points, (the dogmas of Christianity,) and confine my attention at present to the task of laying before my fellow creatures the words of Christ, with a translation from the English into Sungscrit and the language of Bengal. I feel persuaded that, by separating from the other matters contained in the New Testament the moral precepts found in that book, these will be likely to produce the desirable effects of improving the hearts and minds of men of different persuasions and degrees of understanding."—(Introduction, page 23.) The Precepts of Jesus, which I was desirous of teaching, were not, I hoped, "oppos-

Digitized by Google

ed to the doctrines held by the mass of real Christians," nor did my language in the introduction imply the "rejection of those truths which the great body of the learned and pious have concurred in deeming fully contained in the sacred scriptures."

Notwithstanding all this precaution, however, I could not evade the reproach and censure of the Editor, who not only expressed, in the "Friend of India," No. 20, his extreme disapprobation of the compilation, in a manner calculated more to provoke than lead to search after truth, but also indulged himself in calling me an injurer of the cause of truth. Disappointed as I was, I took refuge in the liberal protection of the public, by appealing to them against the unexpected attacks of the Editor. In that appeal I carefully avoided entering into any discussion, as to the doctrines held up as the fundamental principles of Christianity by the Editor. The language of my first appeal is this: "Humble as he (the compiler) is, he has therefore adopted those measures which he thought most judicious to spread the truth in an acceptable manner; but I am sorry to observe, that he (the compiler) has unfortunately and unexpectedly met with opposition from those whom he considered the last persons likely to oppose him on this subject." (Page 121.) "Whether or not he (the compiler) has erred in his judgment, that point must be determined by those who will candidly peruse and consider the arguments already advanced on this subject, bearing in mind the lesson particularly taught by the Saviour himself, of adapting his instructions to the susceptibility and capacity of his hearers,

Digitized by Google

John xvi. 12—'I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now.'" (Page 122.) "What benefit or peace of mind can we bestow upon a Mussulman, who is an entire stranger to the Christian world, by communicating to him, without preparatory instruction, all the peculiar dogmas of Christianity?" (Page 123.) "The compiler obviously having in view at least one object in common with the Reviewer and Editor, that of procuring respect for the precepts of Christ, might have reasonably expected more charity from professed teachers of his doctrine." (P. 105.) In reviewing the First Appeal, the Reverend Editor fully introduced the doctrines of the Godhead of Jesus and the Holy Ghost, and of the Atonement, as the only foundation of Christianity; whereby he compelled me, as a professed believer of one God, to deny, for the first time publicly, those doctrines; and now he takes occasion to accuse me of presumption in teaching doctrines which he has himself compelled me to avow.

The Editor assigns, as a reason for entering on this controversy, that, after a review of the "Precepts of Jesus, and the First Appeal," he "felt some doubt whether their author fully believed the Deity of Christ," and, consequently, he "adduced a few passages from the scriptures to confirm this doctrine." He then adds, that this Second Appeal to the Christian public confirms all that he before only feared. (Page 1.) I could have scarcely credited this assertion of the Reviewer's unacquaintance with my religious opinions, if the allegation had come from any other quarter; for both in my conversation and

Digitized by Google

correspondence with as many missionary gentlemen, old and young, as I have had the honor to know, I have never hesitated, when required, to offer my sentiments candidly, as to the unscripturality and unreasonableness of the doctrine of the Trinity. On one occasion particularly, when on a visit to one of the reverend colleagues of the Editor, at Serampore, long before the time of these publications, I discussed the subject with that gentleman at his invitation; and then fully manifested my disbelief of this doctrine, taking the liberty of examining successively all the arguments he, from friendly motives, urged upon me in support of it. Notwithstanding these circumstances, I am inclined to believe, from my confidence in the character of the Editor, that either those Missionary gentlemen that were acquainted with my religious sentiments have happened to omit the mention of them to him, or he has forgotten what they had communicated on this subject, when he entered on the review of my publications on Christianity.

In page 503, the Editor insinuates that vanity had led me to presume that "freedom from the powerful effects of early religious impressions" has enabled me to "discover the truths of scripture, in its most important doctrines, more fully in three or four years, than others have done by most unremitting study in thirty or forty." The doctrine of the Trinity appears to me so obviously unscriptural, that I am pretty sure, from my own experience and that of others, that no one, possessed of merely common sense, will fail to find its unscripturality after a me-

Digitized by Google

thodical study of the Old and New Testaments, unless previously impressed in the early part of his life with creeds and forms of speech preparing the way to that doctrine. No pride, therefore, can be supposed for a moment to have arisen from commonly attainable success. The Editor might be fully convinced of this fact, were he to engage a few independent and diligent natives to study attentively, both the Old and New Testaments in their original languages, and then to offer their sentiments as to the doctrine of the Trinity being scriptural or a mere human invention.

To hold up to ridicule my suggestions in the Second Appeal, to study first the books of the Old Testament, unbiassed by ecclesiastic opinions, imbibed in early life, and then to study the New Testament, the reverend Editor states, that "could it be relied on indeed," my compendious method "would deserve notice, with a view to Christian education; as," on my plan, "the most certain way of enabling any one to discover, in a superior manner, the truths and doctrines of Christianity, is to leave him till the age of thirty or forty, without any religious impression."—(Page 503.) I do not in the least wonder at his disapprobation of my suggestion; as the Editor, in common with other professors of traditional opinions, is sure of supporters of his favorite doctrine, so long as it is inculcated on the minds of youths, and even infants, who, being once thoroughly impressed with the name of the Trinity in Unity, and Unity in Trinity, long before they can think for themselves, must be always inclined, even after their reason has

Digitized by Google

become matured, to interpret the sacred books, even those texts which are evidently inconsistent with this doctrine, in a manner favorable to their prepossessed opinion, whether their study be continued for three, or thirty, or twice thirty years. Could Hindooism continue after the present generation, or bear the studious examination of a single year, if the belief of their idols being endued with animation, were not carefully impressed on the young before they come to years of understanding?

Let me here suggest, that, in my humble opinion, no truly liberal and wise parent can ever take advantage of the unsuspecting and confiding credulity of his children to impress them with an implicit belief in any set of abstruse doctrines, and intolerance of all other opinions, the truth or reasonableness of which they are incapable of estimating. Still less would he urge by threats the danger of present and eternal punishment, for withholding a blind assent to opinions they are unable to comprehend. Parents are bound, by every moral tie, to give their children such an education as may be sufficient to render them capable of exercising their reason as rational and social beings, and of forming their opinion on religious points, without ill-will towards others, from a thorough investigation of the scriptures, and of the evidence and arguments adduced by teachers of different persuasions. Judgments, thus formed, have a real claim to respect from those who have not the means of judging for themselves. But of what consequence is it, in a question of truth or error, to know how the matter at issue has been considered, even

Digitized by Google

for a hundred generations, by those who have blindly adopted the creed of their fathers? Surely the unbiassed judgment of a person who has proceeded to the study of the Sacred Scriptures, with an anxious desire to discover the truth they contain, even if his researches were to be continued but for a single twelvemonth, ought, as far as authority goes in such matters, to outweigh the opinions of any number who have either not thought at all for themselves, or have studied after prejudice had laid hold of their minds. What fair inquiry respecting the doctrine of the Trinity can be expected from one who has been, on the bosom of his mother, constantly taught to ask the blessing of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, and to hear the very name of Unitarian with horror? Have the doctrines of the Vedant ever succeeded in suppressing polytheism amongst the generality of Hindoos, brought up with the notion of the Godhead of the sun, of fire, and of water, and of the separate and independent existence of the allegorical representations of the attributes of God? Were the sublime works, written by the learned among the Greeks, ever able to shake the early acquired superstitious notions and polytheistical faith of the generality of their countrymen? Nay, even when Christian converts became numerous, did not those who were brought up in the ancient superstition introduce some vestiges of their idolatry into their new persuasion? In fact, nothing can more surely impede the progress of truth, than prejudice instilled into minds blank to receive impressions; and the more unreasonable are

Digitized by Google

the doctrines of a religion, the greater pains are taken by the supporters of them to plant them in the readily susceptible minds of youth.

The Editor has filled a complete page in proving that, besides early impressed prejudices, there are also other causes of error in judgment—an attempt which might have been dispensed with; for I never limited the sources of mistake in examining religious matters to early impression alone. I attributed only the prevailing errors in Christianity to traditional instructions inculcated in childhood, as the language of my Second Appeal will shew. "Having derived my own opinions on this subject entirely from the scriptures themselves, I may perhaps be excused for the confidence with which I maintain them against those of so great a majority, who appeal to the same authority for their's; inasmuch as I attribute their different views, not to any inferiority of judgment compared with my own limited ability, but to the powerful effects of early religious impressions; for when these are deep, reason is seldom allowed its natural scope in examining them to the bottom." [Pp. 304—305.] If the Editor doubt the accuracy of this remark, he might soon satisfy himself of its justice, were he to listen to the suggestion offered in the preceding paragraph, with a view to ascertain whether the doctrine of the Trinity rests for its belief on scriptural authorities, or on early religious impressions.

The Editor mentions, ironically, (in page 3,) that my success in scriptural studies was such "as to prove that the most learned and pious in every age of the

church have been so completely mistaken as to transform the pure religion of Jesus into the most horrible idolatry." In answer to this, I only beg to ask the Rev. Editor to let me know first what a Protestant in the fifteenth century could have answered, if he had been thus questioned by a Roman Catholic: "Is your success in examining the truths of scripture such as to prove that the most learned and pious in every age of the church have been so completely mistaken as to transform the pure religion of Jesus into the most horrible idolatry, by introducing the worship of Mary the mother of God, and instituting images in churches, as well as by acknowledging the pope as the head of the church, vested with the power of forgiving sins?" Would not his answer be this, "My success is indeed so as to prove these doctrines to be unscriptural. As to your inferences, they are no more divine than mine; and though I do not doubt the piety and learning of many Christians of your church in every age, I am persuaded that many corruptions, introduced into the Christian religion by the Roman heathens converted in the fourth and fifth centuries, have been handed down through successive generations by impressions made in the early part of life, and have taken such root in the minds of men, that piety and learning have fallen short of eradicating prejudices nourished by church and state, as well as by the vulgar superstition and enthusiasm." Were this reply justifiable, I also might be allowed to offer the following answer: "I find not the doctrine of the Trinity in the scriptures; I cannot receive any human creed for divine truth; but, with

Digitized by Google

out charging the supporters of this doctrine with impiety or fraud, humbly attribute their misinterpretation of the Scriptures to 'early religious impressions.'"

The Editor assigns as a reason for his omission of several arguments, adduced in the Second Appeal, that "we have before us a work of a hundred and seventy-three pages, to an examination of which we can scarcely devote half that number: and while to leave a single page unnoticed, might by some be deemed equivalent to leaving it unanswered, the mere transcription of the passages to be answered were it done in every instance, would occupy nearly all the room we can give the reply itself. We shall therefore adduce such evidence for these doctrines, as, if sound, will render every thing urged against them nugatory, though not particularly noticed." To enable the public to compare the extent of the Second Appeal with that of the Review, I beg to observe, that the former contains 173 widely printed and the latter 128 closely printed pages, and that if any one will take the trouble of comparing the number of words per page in the two Essays, he will soon satisfy himself that the one is as long as the other. I will afterwards notice, in the course of the present reply, whether or not "the evidence of these doctrines," adduced by the Editor in the Review, has still left a great many arguments in the Appeal quite unanswered.

In his attempt to prove the insufficiency of the precepts of Jesus to procure men peace and happiness, the Rev. Editor advanced the following posi-

Digitized by Google

tion, "that the most excellent precepts, the most perfect law, can never lead to happiness and peace, unless by causing men to take refuge in the doctrine of the cross," (No. 1 Quarterly Series of the Friend of India, page 111,) without adducing any arguments having reference to the position. I therefore brought to his recollection (in my First and Second Appeals,) such authorities of the gracious author of Christianity, as I conceived established the sufficiency of these precepts for leading to comfort, and solicited the Editor "to point out, in order to establish his position, even a single passage pronounced by Jesus, enjoining refuge in the doctrine of the cross, as all-sufficient or indispensable for salvation." (P. 153 of the Second Appeal.) The Editor, instead of endeavoring to demonstrate the truth of his assertion as to the insufficiency of the precepts to conduct men to happiness, or shewing a single passage of the nature applied for, introduces a great number of other passages of Scripture, which he thinks well calculated to prove that the death of Jesus was an atonement for the sins of mankind. I regret that the Editor should have adopted such an irregular mode of arguing in solemn religious discussion; and I still more regret to find that some readers should overlook the want of connexion between the position advanced and the authorities adduced by the Editor. Were we both to adopt such a mode of controversy, as to cite passages apparently favorable to our respective opinions without adhering to the main ground, the number of his Reviews, and of my Appeals, would increase at least in proportion to the number

Digitized by Google

of the years of our lives; for verses and quotations of scripture, if unconnected with their context, and interpreted without regard to the idiom of the languages in which they were written, may, as experience has shewn, be adduced to support any doctrine whatever; and the Editor may always find a majority of readers of the same religious sentiments with himself, satisfied with any thing that he may offer, either in behalf of the Trinity or in support of the Atonement.

Whether Jesus died actually as a sacrifice for the sins of men, or merely in the fulfilment of the duties of his office as the Messiah, as it was predicted, is merely a matter of opinion, the truth of which can only be ascertained from a diligent examination of the terms used and doctrines set forth in the evangelical writings. This however has no relation to a proof or disproof of the sufficiency of his precepts for salvation. In order to come to a conclusion, as to the value of the precepts of Jesus being either really effectual or merely nominal, I deem it necessary to repeat a few passages already quoted in my Appeals, to ask the Editor, whether they demand explicit belief or are unworthy of credit; and in case he admit the former alternative, I should beg to ask him, whether they confirm the opinion that the precepts preached by Jesus are sufficient to lead men to eternal peace and happiness, or are a set of sentences delivered by him conformably to the principles of his hearers, similar to other codes of moral law written by the ancient philosophers of Greece,

Digitized by Google

Egypt, and India? The passages in question are as follow:

Mark xii 29: "Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment. And the second is like unto it, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these." Is there another commandment absolutely enjoining refuge in the doctrine of the cross, so as to shew that these two commandments are insufficient for salvation, and comparatively insignificant?

Matthew vii. 24: "Therefore, whosoever heareth these sayings of mine," (alluding to the precepts contained in ch. v. vi. and vii.) "and doth them, I will liken him unto a wise man who built his house upon a rock," &c. Are not these sayings declared by Jesus to afford a stable foundation, on which may be raised the indestructible edifice of eternal life? John xv. 10: "If ye keep my commandments ye shall abide in my love." Ver. 14: "Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you." I therefore again ask the Rev. Editor to shew a commandment of Jesus directing refuge in the doctrine of the cross, in the same explicit way as he has enjoined love to God and to neighbors, and obedience to his precepts as sufficient means for attaining eternal happiness. Did not Jesus in Matthew xxv. 31, et seq. by means of a parable in the description of the day of judgment,

Digitized by Google

declare that acts of charity and beneficence toward fellow-creatures will be accepted as the manifestation of love towards God, and be the sufficient cause of eternal life?

With a view to depreciate the weight of the following explicit promise of Jesus, "Do this, and thou shalt live," the Editor interprets, (P. 509) that "Jesus taking him" (the lawyer) "on his own principles, as though he had been, what he vainly imagined himself, a sinless man who needed no Saviour, directed him to the whole of the divine law, adding, 'This do, and thou shalt live,' though he knew that it was utterly impossible for that lawyer to observe his instructions." The Editor, however, quite forgot that by his attempt to undervalue the precepts of Jesus, he was actually degrading the dignity of the author of them; for, according to his interpretation, it appears that, the lawyer tempted Jesus by putting to him a question which he thought the Saviour could not answer; so Jesus, in return, tempted him by directing him to do what he knew to be impossible for a man to perform, though this very teacher forbids others to shew revenge even to enemies. Did Jesus take also the scribe "upon his own principles," by instructing him in these two commandments?*—a man who was never inclined to tempt Jesus, but having heard him reasoning, "and perceiving that he had answered well, asked him which is the first commandment of all?"† and when he heard the reply of Jesus, he said "well, master, thou hast said the truth,"—a man whom Jesus declared to be at least

* Mark xii. 29. † Mark xii. 28—34.

Digitized by Google

out of danger of hell for his acknowledgment of the truth of his precepts as the means of salvation, telling him "*thou art not far from the kingdom of heaven?*" Did Jesus on the Mount take also his disciples "upon their own principle," as though they had been, what they vainly imagined themselves, sinless men who needed no Saviour, in directing them to his precepts, the observance of which he knew utterly impossible, and in holding out promises* of eternal salvation as the necessary consequence of their obedience to those sayings?—Were we to follow the mode of interpretation adopted in this instance by the Editor, the Bible would serve only to suit our convenience, and would not be esteemed any longer as a guide to mankind; for, according to the same mode of interpretation, would it not be justifiable to explain Matthew xxviii. 19, "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them," &c. that Jesus took his apostles "upon their own principle," as firmly persuaded to believe in the sanctification attainable by the baptism introduced by John the Baptist, although he was aware that immersion in water could produce no effect in changing the state of the heart?

In reply to his question, "Did Jesus, who knew the hearts of all, regard this lawyer as perfectly sinless, an exception to all mankind?" (Page 9,) I must say that the context seems to me to shew that neither Jesus considered the lawyer to be a sinless, perfect man, (as is evident from his directing him to the scriptures for a guide to salvation,) "Do this and thou shalt live," and "Go and do thou likewise;" nor

* Matthew vii. 24, 25.

Digitized by Google

did the lawyer vainly imagine himself "a sinless man who needed no Saviour," though he endeavored to put the claim of Jesus to that title, to the proof, in these words, "Master what shall I do to inherit eternal life?".

Although I declared in the Second Appeal, (Page 150) that by the term "law," in the verse "If righteousness came by the law, Christ is dead in vain," all the commandments found in the books of Moses are understood, yet the Rev. Editor charges me with an unintelligible expression, and intimates his inability to ascertain whether I meant by "law" the ceremonial or the moral part of the books of Moses, (P. 507.) I therefore beg to explain the verse more fully, that the Rev. Editor may have an opportunity of commenting upon it at large. St. Paul, knowing the efficacy of the perfection introduced by Jesus into the law given by Moses, declares, that, had the system of the Mosaical law been sufficient to produce light among the Jews and Gentiles, without being perfected by Jesus, this attempt made by Christ to perfect it would have been superfluous, and his death, which was the consequence of his candid instructions, would have been to no purpose.

The Editor notices frequently my expression of the neglect of duty on the part of man to the Creator and to his fellow-creatures; nevertheless, he fills up more than two pages in proving this point. He has not, however, attempted to counteract the force of the passages I quoted in both of my Appeals, shewing that the guilt occasioned by the

Digitized by Google

want of due obedience to the precepts in question may be pardoned, through repentance prescribed by the author of those precepts, as the sure and only remedy for human failure. I therefore beg to ask the Editor to give a plain explanation of the following passages selected from my Appeals, that the reader may be able to judge, whether or not repentance can procure us the blessings of pardon, for our constant omissions in the discharge of the duties laid down in the precepts of Jesus. Luke v. 32: "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." Does not Jesus declare a chief object of his mission to be the calling of sinners to repentance? Luke xxiv. 47: "That repentance and remission of sins should be preached, in his name, among all nations." Did not Jesus, by this commandment to his disciples, declare the remission of sins as an immediate and necessary consequence of repentance? In Luke xiii. 3: Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish," the indispensability of repentance for the forgiveness of sins is explicitly declared. Is not also the mercy of God illustrated by the example of a father forgiving the transgressions of his son through his sincere repentance alone, in the parable of the prodigal son? Those who place confidence in the divine mission of Jesus, or even in his veracity, will not hesitate, I trust, for a moment, to admit that Jesus has directed us to sincere repentance as the only means of procuring pardon, knowing the inability of men to give entire obedience to his precepts; and that Jesus would have recommended the lawyer,

Digitized by Google

whom he directed to righteousness, to have recourse to repentance "had he gone and sincerely attempted" to obey his precepts, "watching his own heart to discern those constant neglects of the duty he owed to the Creator and to his fellow-creatures," and then applied to Jesus for the remedy of his discerned imperfections.

I find abundant passages in the Old Testament, also, representing other sources than sacrifices, as sufficient means of procuring pardon for sin. Psalm li. 17:—"The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise." Ezekiel xviii. 30:—"Repent and turn yourselves from all your transgressions; so iniquity shall not be your ruin." Proverbs xvi. 6:—"By mercy and truth iniquity is purged, and by the fear of the Lord men depart from evil." Isaiah i. 18:—"Come now and let us reason together, saith the Lord. Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool."

To shew the inefficacy of repentance to procure pardon, the Editor appeals to human justice, which, as he says, "inquires not about the repentance of the robber and murderer, but respecting his guilt. The law, indeed, knows no repentance."—(Page 506.) I therefore wish to know whether or not human justice suffers an innocent man to be killed, to atone for the guilt of theft or murder committed by another? It is, at all events, more consistent with justice, that a judge who has the privilege of shewing mercy, should forgive the crimes of those that

Digitized by Google

truly feel the pain and distress of mind inseparable from sincere repentance, than that he should put an innocent man to death, or destroy his own life, to atone for the guilt of some of his condemned culprits.

CHAPTER II.

Inquiry into the Doctrine of the Atonement.

In his first Review, the Editor began with what he considered "the most abstruse, and yet the most important of Christian doctrines, the Deity of Jesus Christ," and then proceeded to substantiate the doctrine of his atonement. I therefore followed this course of arrangement in my Second Appeal; but as the Editor has introduced the doctrine of the atonement of Jesus first in the present Review, I will also arrange my reply accordingly.

The Editor quotes first, Genesis iii. 15:—"I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." From this passage he attempts to deduce the atonement of Jesus for the sins of men, demanding, "What could a reptile feel, relative to the fate of its offspring, through future ages? of what individual serpents did the seed of the woman break the head, so as for it to bruise his heel?"—"Jesus, then," he affirms, "is the seed of the woman who suffered from the malice of Satan, while he, on the cross, destroyed his power by atoning for sin and reconciling man

Digitized by Google

to God."—(Page 517.) I admit that a reptile, as far as human experience goes, is incapable of feeling "relative to the fate of its offspring through future ages;" but I wish to know if a mere reptile could not have the power of conversation, so as to persuade a woman to adhere to its advice; whether the ass of Balaam could be possessed of the power of seeing exclusively the angel of God, and conversing with its own master Balaam? and whether ravens could diligently supply the wants of Elijah, by bringing him bread and flesh morning and evening? Are not these occurrences equally difficult to reconcile to "common sense" as the case of the serpent is, according to the Editor? Yet we find these stated in the sacred books, and we are taught to believe them as they stand. Can we justly attempt to represent the ass, and those ravens also, as either angelical or demoniacal spirits, in the same way as the reptile is represented by the Editor to have been no other than Satan? We might, in that case, be permitted to give still greater latitude to metaphor, so as to take all the facts found in the Bible as merely allegorical representations; but would not the consequence of such interpretations be most dangerous to the cause of truth? The verse in question, with its context, thus runs:— "And the Lord God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above* all cattle and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life. And I will put enmity between

* מכל Composed of two words, מן and כל i. e. *out of all*.

Digitized by Google

thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise his heel." Do not the phrases, "Thou art cursed above *all cattle*," and "above *every beast* of the field," shew clearly that the serpent thus addressed was really no spirit in borrowed from, but the animal so denominated? Does not the circumstance of the serpent being condemned to move upon its belly, and to eat dust all the days of its life, evidently imply that the serpent thus cursed was of the same class that we now see subject to that very malediction to the present day? The sins of fathers are declared in the scriptures to have been visited by God on their posterity; would it not be, therefore, more consistent with scriptural authorities to attribute the misery of serpents to the heinous conduct of their first origin, than to Satan, of whom no mention is made throughout the chapter in question?

But, in fact, has the power of Satan over the seed of the woman been destroyed? The consequences of the sin which our first parents committed by the ill advice of the reptile, and which they implanted in the nature of their posterity, have been, that women bring forth children in sorrow, and are ruled by their husbands, and that the earth brings forth thorns also and thistles to men, who eat the herb of the field with labor, and return at last to dust.—(Genesis iii. 16—19.) If Jesus actually atoned for sin, and delivered men from its consequences, how can those men and women, who believe in his atonement, be still, equally with others, liable to the evil effects of the sins already remitted by the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus?

Digitized by Google

If, notwithstanding all the above-stated facts and arguments, the Editor still insists that Satan should be understood by the reptile mentioned in the verse, and Jesus by the seed of the woman, yet his interpretation cannot apply in the least to the doctrine of the atonement. It would imply only, that, as Satan opposed the power of Jesus to procure salvation for all men, as he intended, so Jesus diminished his power, and disappointed him by leading many to salvation through his divine precepts. I know not how to answer the question of the Editor, "Of what individual serpent did the seed of the woman break the head, so as for it to bruise his heel?" unless by referring him to the reciprocal injuries which man and serpents inflict on each other.

The Editor refers to the circumstance of the sacrifice offered by Abel, and approved of God in reference to his brother Cain's, (Gen. iv. 4,) esteeming it as an illustration of the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus for the remission of sin.—(Page 518.) But I am unable to find out what relation there could exist between the acceptance of the offering of Abel by Jehovah, and the death of Jesus, whether sacrificial or not.—The Editor, however, founds his assertion, that Abel having looked forward to the atonement of Jesus, his offerings were accepted by God, upon the circumstance of Abraham's seeing the day of Christ by prophetic anticipation, (John viii. 56,) and of Moses having esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt, (Heb. xi. 26,*)

* (Improved Version of the New-Testament,) Gr. "the reproach of Christ," or, "of the anointed." The Israelites are called Christ's, or anointed, i. e. a chosen and favored people, Psalm cv. 15, Heb. iii. 13. "The meaning is,"

Digitized by Google

they all having been "of the same catalogue." I, therefore, should hope to be informed whether there be any authority justifying this inference. On the contrary, we find the fourth verse of the same chapter of Genesis points out, that Abel, having been accustomed to do well, in obedience to the will of God, contrary to the practice of his brother, righteous Jehovah accepted his offering, and rejected that of Cain; to which Paul thus alludes,—"By faith Abel offered a more excellent sacrifice than Cain," (Hebrew xi. 4,) without leaving us doubtful as to the sense in which that apostle used the word "faith" in the above verse.

"By faith Abel offered unto God," &c. "By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death," &c. "But without faith it is impossible to please him; for he that *cometh to God* must believe that *he is*, and that he is a *rewarder of them* who diligently seek him." Here St. Paul gives us to understand that the "faith" which procured for Abel, Enoch, Noah, and all the other patriarchs, the grace of God, was their belief in the *existence* of God, and in his being their *rewarder*, and not in any sacrifice personal or vicarious. What could prophetic anticipation by Abraham, of the divine commission of Jesus, have to do with Abel's conduct, in rendering his sacrifices acceptable to God, that any one can esteem the one as the necessary consequence of the other? Moses

says Dr. Sykes, in loc. "that Moses looked upon the contempt and indignity which he underwent on account of his professing himself a Jew, as much preferable to all the riches and honors of Egypt." See also Whitby, in loc. Dr. Newcome's Version is, "such reproach as Christ endured," which is also the interpretation of Photius, Crellius, and Mr. Lindsey, Sequel, page 278.

Digitized by Google

having called himself a Jew, gave preference to the term "anointed," or "Israelite," a term of reproach among the Egyptians in those days, over all the riches and honor of Egypt, which he might have obtained by declaring himself an Egyptian instead of a Jew; or Moses esteemed (according to the English version) in his prophetic power, the reproach to which Christ would be made liable by the Jews in the fulfilment of his divine commission, greater riches than all the grandeur of Egyptian unbelievers.—But neither explanation can support the idea that Abel, or any other patriarch, had in view the sacrificial death of Jesus in rendering their offering acceptable to God.

It is true, as the Editor observes, that sacrifices are divine institutions as a manifestation of obedience to God, through the oblation of any thing that may be dear to man, whether common, as an animal, or dearly valuable, as one's own son. But they are not represented in any of the sacred books as means, having intrinsically the power of procuring men pardon and eternal salvation. They seem, in fact, intended for men unaccustomed to the worship of God in truth and spirit. The following passages suffice to illustrate this beyond doubt. Micah vi. 7, 8:—"Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my first born for my transgression; the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good, and what doth the Lord *require* of thee *but to do justly*, and *to love mercy*, and *to walk humbly* with thy God?" Here Jehovah,

Digitized by Google

while shewing his displeasure at mere animal sacrifices, enjoins just actions and humility in lieu of them, as worthy to be accepted by God, without substituting human sacrifices in their stead. Hosea vi. 6:—"For I desired mercy *and not sacrifice*, and the knowledge of God more than burnt-offerings." Isaiah 1—11, [i. 11, 16—18,] "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord. I am full of the burnt-offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he-goats.—Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow. Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord; though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be *as white as snow*," &c.—Does not Jehovah here substitute good works alone for sacrifices, as real means of taking away sins? Psalm l. 8 [8—15,] "I will not reprove thee for thy sacrifices or thy burnt-offerings, to have been continually before me. I will take no bullock out of thy house, nor he-goats out of thy folds. For every beast of the forest is mine, and the cattle upon a thousand hills. I know all the fowls of the mountains; and the wild beasts of the field are mine. If I were hungry I would not tell thee; for the world is mine, and the fulness thereof. Will I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats? Offer unto God thanksgiving; and pay thy vows unto the Most High; and call upon me in the day of trouble: I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me." Jeho-

Digitized by Google

vah, who protests against the idea of the flesh of bulls being supposed his food, and the blood of goats his drink, cannot be supposed to have had delight in human blood, the blood of his beloved Son. Samuel xv. 22:—"And Samuel said, Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." Proverbs xxi. 3:—"To do justice and judgment is more acceptable to the Lord than sacrifice." Eccles. v. 1:—"Keep thy foot when thou goest to the house of God, and be more ready to hear than to give the *sacrifice of fools;* for they consider not that they *do evil.*"

It is now left for us to ascertain in what sense we should take such phrases as, "This man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins;" "Christ hath once appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself;" "Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate;" "I am the living bread;" "If any man eat of this," &c. Whether do these passages imply that Jesus, though he preferred mercy to sacrifice, (Matthew ix. 13, xii. 7,) did actually sacrifice himself, and offer his own blood to God as an atonement for the sins of others; or do they mean that Jesus, knowing already that the fulfilment of his divine commission would endanger his life, never hesitated to execute it, and suffered his blood to be shed in saving men from sin through his divine precepts and pure example, which were both opposed to the religious system adopted by his cotemporary Jews? Were

Digitized by Google

we to follow the former mode of interpretation, and take all these phrases in their strictly literal sense, we must be persuaded to believe that God, not being contented with the blood of bulls and goats, and other animal sacrifices, offered to him by the Israelites, insisted upon the offer of the blood and life of his Son, as the condition of his forgiving the sins of men; and that Jesus accordingly offered his blood to propitiate God, and also proposed to men actually to eat his flesh! Would not the doctrines of Christianity, in this case, representing God as delighted with human victims, and directing men to cannibalism, appear monstrous to every civilized being? No one, unless biassed by prejudices, can justify such inconsistency, as to interpret literally some of the above-mentioned phrases in support of the doctrine of the atonement, and explain the last quoted figuratively, as they are all confessedly alike subversive of every rational idea of the nature of the divine justice and mercy.

To avoid such a stigma upon the pure religion of Jesus, it is incumbent, I think, upon us to follow the latter mode of interpretation, and to understand, from the passages referred to, that Jesus, the spiritual Lord and King of Jews and Gentiles, in fulfilment of the duties of his mission, exposed his own life for the benefit of his subjects, purged their sins by his doctrines, and persevered in executing the commands of God, even to the undergoing of bodily suffering in the miserable death of the cross; a self-devotion or sacrifice, of which no Jewish high priest had ever offered an example.

Digitized by Google

Ought not this belief in the unbounded beneficence of Jesus to excite superior gratitude, love, and reverence towards our Saviour and King, than the idea that he, as God, above mortal afflictions, borrowed human nature for a season, and offered this fictitious man as a sacrifice for the remission of sin, while he himself was no more afflicted with that sacrificial death than with the sufferings of other human individuals. If there be, in this latter case, any gratitude felt for the afflictions which attached to the death of the cross, it should be manifested to that temporary man Jesus, and not to Jesus the Christ, whom the Editor and other Trinitarians esteem as God, above pain and death.

If it be urged, that it is inconsistent with common justice to pardon sin that requires the capital punishment of death without an atonement for it, it may be replied, that the perfection of divine justice, as well as other attributes of God, should not be measured by what are found in, and adopted by, the human race. Is it consistent with our common notions of justice to visit the sins of fathers on their descendants, as God ascribed to himself, (Exodus xx. 5.)? Is it consistent with our common notions of justice to afflict men with infinite punishment for their finite guilt, as Jesus declares in Matthew xviii. 8.? Even in the present case, would it be consistent with common notions of justice to afflict an innocent man with the death of the cross, for sins committed by others, even supposing the innocent man should voluntarily offer his life in behalf of those others? We can have no idea of the perfection of divine justice, mer-

Digitized by Google

cy, and wrath, unless from what is revealed to us; and as we find, in the sacred books, that sins have been pardoned in consequence of the intercession of righteous men, without any sacrificial atonement, we should, therefore, be contented with those authorities, and should not entertain doubt as to pardon being bestowed upon those who have had the advantage of the intercession of Jesus, exalted as he was by God over all prophets and righteous men that ever lived.

Numb. xiv. 19—20:—Moses prayed to the Lord, "Pardon, I beseech thee, the iniquity of this people according unto the greatness of thy mercy, and as thou hast forgiven this people from Egypt even until now; and the Lord said I have pardoned *according to thy word.*" 2 Chron. xxx. 18—20:—"For a multitude of the people, even many of Ephraim and Manasseh, Issachar and Zebulon, had not cleansed themselves, yet did they eat the passover otherwise than it was written. But Hezekiah prayed for them, saying, The good Lord pardon every one that prepareth his heart to seek God, the Lord God of his fathers, though he be not cleansed according to the purification of the sanctuary. And the Lord hearkened to Hezekiah, and healed the people." Psalm cvi. 23:—"Therefore he said that he would destroy them, had not Moses, his chosen, stood before him in the breach to turn away his wrath, lest he should destroy them." Did not Jehovah here forgive the sins of Israel from the intercession of Moses, without having the least reference to the offer of animal or human blood? Psalm xxxii. 5:—"I acknowledged

Digitized by Google

my sin unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid; I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord, and thou *forgavest* the iniquity of my sin." Were not sins forgiven in this instance also, through confession and humility without blood-offerings? Psalm cxli. 2:—"Let *my prayer be set forth* before thee as incense; and the *lifting up of my hands* as the evening sacrifice." Isaiah lv. 7:—"Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon." Jer. vii. 21—23:—"Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, Put your *burnt-offerings unto your sacrifices, and eat flesh.* For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning *burnt-offerings* or sacrifices. But this thing commanded I them, saying, *obey* my *voice*, and I will be your God and ye shall be my people," &c. Here we find prayers and obedience preferred to animal sacrifices as means of pardon, and no reference, direct or figurative, to propitiation, to be made by human blood. Such an attempt, therefore, as to represent human blood, or that of God in human form, in lieu of animal blood, as an indispensable atonement for sins, is, I think, unscriptural.

The Editor quotes, (page 519,) Heb. x:—"It is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins. Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me; in burnt-offerings and sacrifices thou hast had no pleasure." And he attempts thereby to prove that

"sacrifices, considered in themselves, then, were never desired by God; they are approved merely with a view to his making atonement for whom God had prepared a body," and that "they ceased after he had offered himself a sacrifice for sin." How strange is the idea, that "God, who preserves man and beast, nor suffers a sparrow to fall to the ground without his permission;" and by whom sacrifices "were never desired for their own sake," should have caused millions of animals to be slaughtered, at different times, by men, under the mistaken notion of their being an atonement for sins, while he has been remitting iniquity from eternity, referring only to the real and sufficient atonement made by Jesus for the sins of all men that ever lived from the beginning of the world!

How inconsistent is such an idea with the known mercy of that Providence, whose unwillingness to receive human sacrifices was such, that when Abraham had proved his fidelity by binding his son on the altar, God stayed his hand from the sacrifice, and produced a ram, unexpectedly, before him, which he was graciously pleased to accept as an offering in *the stead of Isaac!*—(Gen. xxii. 13.) How can we imagine that God should have received the offering which he himself had thus prepared, with reference solely to the future sacrifice of a being far superior in excellence to Isaac, whose life he mercifully preserved?

As to the above cited verses, they rather corroborate the second mode of interpretation, noticed in the preceding paragraphs, than the doctrine of a real human sacrifice in the Christian dispensation; for, in

Digitized by Google

verses fifth and sixth, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews declares the dissatisfaction of God with sacrifices and offerings, in general terms, without limiting them to any particular species, whether of man or of animal. The language of the fifth verse, "Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me," confirms the idea that the divine disregard of mere sacrifice led to the preparation of a body for Jesus, through which he could impart to mankind the perfection of the will and laws of God, in a manner consistent with the divine nature, teaching them to yield to God a heart-felt, instead of a ceremonial and outward obedience, and thereby putting an end to the further effusion of blood, as a testimony of humility, gratitude, and devotion.

Hence, it appears more consistent with the context and the general tenor of scripture, to understand by the phrase, "The offering of the body of Jesus Christ," (quoted often by the Editor,) the death of Jesus as a spiritual and virtual sacrifice for the sins of all those for whom he became a mediator; inasmuch as by that death the blessed Saviour testified his perfect obedience and devotion to the will of his heavenly Father, and thereby vindicated to himself the unlimited favor of God. During his life he instructed mankind how they might render themselves worthy of the divine mercy: by his death he qualified himself to be their intercessor at the heavenly throne, when sincere repentance was to be offered by them instead of perfect duty. We may easily account for the adoption by the apostles, with

Digitized by Google

respect to him, of such terms as sacrifice and atonement for sin, and their representing Jesus as the high priest, engaged to take away the sins of the world by means of his blood. These were modes of speech made use of in allusion to the sacrifices and blood-offerings which the Jews and their high priest used to make for the remission of sins; and the apostles wisely accommodated their instructions to the ideas and forms of language familiar to those whom they addressed.

How inconsistent would it be, in the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, to declare in one place, that God would not have sacrifice and offering; and again to announce, almost at the same moment, that he was so pleased with sacrifice, even with a human sacrifice, that for its sake he would forgive the sins of the world! Besides, in the Christian dispensation, sacrifice implies a spiritual offering required by God, not only from the author of this religion, but also from his disciples and followers; a fact which may be illustrated by sacred authority. 1 Peter ii. 4, 5:—"To whom coming, as unto a *living stone*, disallowed indeed of men, but *chosen of God and precious*, ye also, as *lively stones*, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up *spiritual sacrifices* acceptable to God by Jesus Christ."

I am not at all disposed to dispute the assertion of the Editor (page 532,) that "a priest without atonement, however, had no existence in the old Testament;" but I must say that a priest without atonement has existence in the New Testament, and refer the Editor to the following verses, excluding those

Digitized by Google

that are applied to Jesus. Rev. i. 6, "And hath made us kings and priests unto God;" xx. 6, "But they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years;" 1 Peter ii. 5, "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood." Moreover, in explaining such phrases as, "I am the living bread,"—"If any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever,"—"The bread that I will give is my flesh,"—"Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man," and "Unless ye eat his flesh, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you,"—"My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed;" Protestant commentators take upon themselves to interpret, that these phrases are in allusion to the manner of sacrifice, and that the eating of the flesh of Jesus, and drinking his blood, must be understood in a spiritual, not in a carnal sense. If these writers make so direct an encroachment upon the literal sense of those phrases, in order to avoid the idea of cannibalism being a tenet of Christianity, why should I not be justified upon the same principles, and on the authority of the apostle, in understanding by sacrifice, in the language of the apostle, a virtual oblation—that Christianity may not be represented as a religion founded upon the horrible system of human victims?

The Editor first refers (page 520) to "Noah's sacrifice on his coming out of the ark;" whence he concludes, that all the genuine religion of the new world was founded on the future atonement made by Christ. He again mentions God having made a promise to Abraham, that in him "shall all the fam-

Digitized by Google

my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day* upon the earth. And though after my *skin worms destroy* this body, yet in my flesh shall *I see God.*"

The Editor having urged in his first review, (page 101,) that the circumstance of the term "lamb" being twice applied to Jesus by John the Baptist, shewed that Jesus came into the world to sacrifice his life as an atonement for sin; I observed to the Editor in my Second Appeal, (page 212,) that such terms as "lamb" and "sheep" were applied in scripture to the disciples of Jesus also; many of whom likewise suffered death in their attempt to withdraw men from sin, yet in these cases no allusion to the sacrificial lamb has ever been made; and that it might be, therefore, safely inferred, that the epithets "lamb" and "sheep" are merely figurative terms for innocence subjected to persecution. The Editor, however, without noticing this observation, quotes in his present review (page 522) some verses of the epistles of Peter and John, in which the apostles use the same epithet "lamb," applied to their gracious Master. It is obvious, from what I stated in my Second Appeal, that I did not dispute the application of that term to Jesus in the scriptural books. I only maintained, that no Christian, whether primitive or modern, could ever apply the word "lamb," in its literal sense, to Jesus, who, as being above the angels of God, is of course far above the nature of a "lamb;" and that, under this

* אחרון signifies properly *afterwards*, without any reference to a particular day.

Digitized by Google

consideration, it must have been used for innocence subjected to persecution, as we find the use of the word "lamb" very frequent elsewhere when applied to man. John xxi. 15, (already quoted in the Second Appeal) "feed my lambs." Luke x. 3, "Behold, I send you forth as lambs among wolves." Genesis xxii. 7, 8, "And he (Isaac) said, Behold the fire and the wood; but where is the lamb for a burnt-offering? And Abraham said, My son, God will provide himself a lamb for a burnt-offering." Wherein, Abraham doubtless meant his innocent son about to be subjected to a violent death, hiding the commandment of God from him, as appears from the following verses:—"And they came to the place which God had told him of; and Abraham built an altar there, and laid the wood in order, and bound Isaac his son and laid him on the altar upon the wood: and Abraham stretched forth his hand, and took the knife to slay his son." Jeremiah xi. 19, "But I was like a lamb or an ox that is brought to slaughter."

Upon the same principle, the apostles generally used "blood" for condescension to death, and "sacrifice" for a virtual one, as I noticed fully in the preceding paragraphs.

The Editor relates, (page 524) that the priest used to lay his hands on the head of a living goat, "and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, putting them on the head of the goat, and by the hand of a fit person to send it away into the wilderness as *an atonement* for *all their sins* in every year." He then infers, from this circumstance, that

Digitized by Google

"commandments like these did more than merely foretel the atonement of Christ." Were we to consider at all the annual scape-goat as an indication of some other atonement for sin, we must esteem it as a sign of Aaron's bearing the iniquities of Israel, both the scape-goat and Aaron having alike borne the sins of others without sacrificing their lives: but by no means can it be supposed a sign of the atonement of Christ, who, according to the author, bore the sins of men by the sacrifice of his own life, and had therefore no resemblance to the scape-goat or Aaron. Exodus xxviii. 38:—"And it shall be upon Aaron's forehead that Aaron may bear the iniquity of the holy things which the children of Israel shall hallow in all their holy gifts; and it shall be always upon his forehead, that they may be accepted before the Lord." I wonder that the Rev. Editor himself notices here that the iniquities of Israel were forgiven by confession over the scape-goat, without animal or human victims, and yet represents the circumstance of the *scape*-goat, as a prediction of the sacrificial *death* of Christ, and insists upon the forgiveness of sins being founded upon the effusion of blood.

The Rev. Editor now begins with Psalm ii. 1. (page 527) stating that in Acts iv. the apostles lifted up "their voices with one accord to God in the very words of the Psalms;" adding verse 27, "For of a truth, against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were gathered together." Secondly, he quotes Psalm xvi. 8—11, comparing them with Acts ii. 25—27; 3dly, Psalm

Digitized by Google

xxii. 1, comparing it with Heb. ii. 10—12; 4thly, Psalm xxxi. 5, while he repeats Psalm xl. 6—8, comparing them to Hebrew x. 4; 5thly, Psalm xlv. 6, 7, comparing it [them] with Hebrew i. 8—12; 6thly, Psalm lxviii. 18, applying it to Ephesians iv. 8—11; 7thly, Psalm lxix. 1, 2, comparing them with John ii. 17, "The zeal of thy house hath eaten me up," and with Romans xv. 3, "Even Christ pleased not himself; but, as it is written, The reproaches of them that reproached thee fell on me;" 8thly, Psalm lxxii. 7—11, 17; 9thly, Psalm lxxxix. 19—37; 10thly, Psalm cii. 4, 5, 10, quoting immediately after this, Heb. i. 7, without comparing one with the other; 11thly, Psalm cxviii. 22; 12thly, Psalm cx. 1, 4. After having filled up more than six pages (527—533) with the quotations of the above Psalms, the Editor observes, that, "notwithstanding the abundant evidence of the atonement, and even the deity of Christ, already adduced from the Pentateuch and the Psalms," &c. But I regret that none of these Psalms appear to me to bear the least reference to the principle of vicarious sacrifice, as an atonement for sin, except Psalm fourteenth, in which a declaration of the displeasure of Jehovah at sacrifice in general is made, and which I have fully examined in the preceding paragraphs. I therefore beg my readers to look over all the Psalms introduced here by the Editor, and to form their opinion whether these are properly applied to the discussion of the doctrine of the atonement; and should they find them having little or no relation to a proof of the atonement, they may then judge whether the frequent complaint

Digitized by Google

of the Editor, of *the want* of *room*, is or is not well founded.

I will examine his attempt to prove the deity of Jesus, from some of these Psalms, in a subsequent chapter on the Trinity, but cannot omit to notice here two or three remarks made by the Editor, in the course of quoting these Psalms, on some of my assertions in the Second Appeal, leaving a decision on them to the free judgment of the public. The Editor having quoted Psalm xl. 6—8, and compared these verses with Hebrews x. 4—7, 9, thus concludes, (Page 528):—" By these declarations various facts are established. They inform us that the grand design of the Son in becoming man was that of being a sacrifice; which fully refutes our author's assertion, (page 202,) that the sole object of his mission was to preach and impart divine instructions." The Editor, I am sorry to say, following a frequent practice of his other orthodox brethren, omits the immediately following verses, which thoroughly explain whether " the will of God," mentioned in verse eighth of the Psalm quoted by the Editor, implies sacrifice or divine instructions:—" I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy *law* is within my heart.—*I have preached* righteousness in the *great congregation*: lo, I have not refrained my lips, O Lord, thou knowest. *I have not hid* thy righteousness within my heart; *I have declared thy faithfulness and thy salvation: I have not concealed thy loving-kindness and thy truth* from the great congregation." It is now left to the public to judge whether Psalm fortieth, quoted by the Editor, establishes that " the grand

Digitized by Google

design of the Son in becoming man was that of being a sacrifice," or of preaching the righteousness of God to the world, and declaring his truth and salvation to them. The preparing of the body for the Son, as found in Hebrews x. 5, implies, of course, the necessity of his being furnished with a body in preaching the will of God to mortal men; a body which, in the fulfilment of his commission, Jesus never valued, but exposed to danger, and virtually offered as a sacrifice.

It is worth observing, that the Editor, though he affirms positively that the grand object of the Son's appearing in this world was to be a sacrifice, and not to inculcate divine instructions, and thinks it proper to rest his position upon a comparison of the above Psalm with Hebrews, yet never attempts to reconcile to this notion the verses pointed out in page 202 of my Second Appeal, proving that the object of his mission was to preach and impart divine instructions. Are we to place greater reliance on his bare affirmation, or on the authority of Jesus himself, the Lord and King of Jews and Gentiles?

Not finding a single assertion in the Scriptures that can support his above notion, the Editor lays stress upon John x. 17: "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again." Do these words imply any thing more than his attributing the love of the Father towards the Son, to his implicit obedience, even to the loss of his own life, taken by the rebellious Jews? Should a general inform his fellow soldiers, that his king is attached to him, in consequence of his being

ready to give up his life in the discharge of his duty, can we thence infer that the grand design of the king, in appointing him general, is his death, and not his reconciling rebels to their merciful king, through friendly entreaty and offers of amnesty, which we know he has employed?

The second conclusion of the Editor from the above quoted Psalms and Hebrews, is, that "they also demonstrate that the Son delighted in offering himself a sacrifice; which refutes that dreadful assertion, that Jesus declared great aversion to the death of the cross, and merely yielded to it, as knowing that the will of his Father rendered such death unavoidable." I find no mention made in Hebrews x. much less in Psalm xl. of the Son's "delighting in offering himself as a sacrifice;" on the contrary, it is evidently found in Hebrews x. that whatever the Son performed with the body prepared him was entirely through his implicit obedience to the will of the Father. Verse 7: "Then said I," (the Son) "Lo, I come to do thy will, O God." "Then said he," (the Son) "Lo, I come to do thy will, O God," ver. 9; an assertion which is thoroughly confirmed by what I quoted in my Second Appeal, (pp. 206, 207,) part of which I am necessitated to repeat here, to shew that Jesus, (whether as man or God, let the Editor decide,) declared great aversion to death, yet yielded to it in common with many other prophets, knowing that the will of his Father rendered such death unavoidable. Matthew xxvi. 37—39, 42:—"And he took with him Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, and began to be sor-

Digitized by Google

rowful and very heavy. Then saith he unto them, My soul is *exceeding sorrowful, even unto death.* And prayed, saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup" (meaning death) "pass from me; nevertheless, *not as I will,* but as thou wilt. He went away again the second time, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if this cup may not pass away from me, except I drink it, thy will be done." Mark xiv. 36: "And he said, Abba Father, all things are possible unto thee; *take away this cup from me:* nevertheless, not what I will, but what thou wilt." Luke xxii. 42, 44: "Saying, Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless, not my will, but thine be done. And being in an agony, he prayed more earnestly; and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground."

Now, let the Editor find out a set of verses, or even a single passage, which may evince that Jesus, so far from feeling aversion to death, delighted in it, as he has attempted to prove; and let him take upon himself to reconcile such gross contradictions between those two sets of passages, (if there be any such,) or reject one set of them.

The third conclusion of the Editor, from the above Psalm, and the compared passage of Hebrews, is, that "they furnish a complete answer to the declaration, (page 206) that it would be a piece of gross iniquity to afflict one innocent being, who had all the human feelings, and who had never transgressed the will of God, with the death of the cross for the crimes committed by others, and (page 207)

Digitized by Google

that the iniquity of one's being sentenced to death, as an atonement for a fault committed by another, is such, that every just man would shudder at the idea of one's being put to death for a crime committed by another, even if the innocent man should willingly offer his life in behalf of that other." The Editor then maintains, that the texts quoted (Psalms and Hebrews) refute the above positions, stating, that "this iniquity, if it be such, the Father willed, since he prepared the Son a body, in which to suffer this palpable injustice." In this I perfectly coincide with the Editor, that the death of the innocent Jesus took place, like that of many preceding prophets, by the unsearchable will of God, who hath ordained that all the sons of men shall die, some by a violent and painful death, others by an easy and natural extinction; nor do I require the evidence of the text quoted, ("Thou hast prepared me a body,") to convince me of the fact, declared by Jesus in his agony in the garden, that his sufferings, in particular, were, like those of mankind in general, conformable to the will of God. But I cannot find any thing in these words that warrants an inference so contrary to our ideas of justice, as, that the pain thus suffered by Jesus was inflicted on him, though innocent, by God, as an atonement to himself for withholding merited punishment from the truly guilty. And this is the real point in discussion. The Editor will admit that the ways of God, in bestowing happiness on some, and leaving others, in our eyes more worthy of divine favor, to wretchedness and misery, are inscrutable; yet, on the bare fact, that the innocent Jesus

Digitized by Google

was ordained to die on the cross, he pretends to rest the conclusion, as the only possible one, that this death he suffered to satisfy the justice of his Maker. Was it for this that John the Baptist was beheaded? Was it for this that Zechariah was slain? Was it as an atonement for the sins of the rest of mankind, that Jerusalem was suffered to "stone the prophets, and kill those who were sent to her"? The Editor will not admit that it was; yet the proposed inference from the bare fact would be as legitimate in these cases as that of Jesus. The plain and obvious conclusion to be drawn from the text is, that God prepared for Christ a body, that he might communicate a perfect code of divine law to mankind, and that he loved him for the devotion with which he fulfilled his divine commission, regardless of the comfort or safety of that body, and his readiness to lay it down when it suited the purpose of the Maker.

The Rev. Editor expresses his indignation at the mode of reasoning adopted by me, in the passages above quoted; saying, "Should not a creature, a worm of the dust, who cannot fully comprehend the mysteries of his own being, pause before he arraign his Maker of gross injustice, and charge him with having founded all religion on an act of palpable iniquity?" (page 529.)

There appears here a most strange mistake on the part of the Editor. It is he who seems to me to be laboring to prove the absurdity that God, the Almighty and all-merciful, is capable of a palpable iniquity—determined to have punishment, though he

Digitized by Google

leave quite unpunished; inflicting the marks of his wrath on the innocent *for the purpose* of sparing those who justly deserve the weight of its terrors. If he mean to object to the rashness of applying the limited capacity of the human understanding to judge the unsearchable things of the wisdom of God, and therefore denies my right, as a worm of the dust, to deduce any thing from human ideas inimical to his view of the divine will, I can only say, that I have for my example that of a fellow-worm, in his own argument to shew the necessity that the Almighty labored under to have his justice satisfied. For I find this very Editor, in his endeavor to prove the doctrine of the atonement, arguing (page 506,) thus: "He who has kept the law has not broken it, and he who has broken it cannot have kept it: that the same man, therefore, should incur its penalty for violating it, and also deserve its reward for keeping it, is an *outrage on common sense.*" "This will clearly appear, if we refer to *human laws*, imperfect as they are." "Apply this to the divine law." "For him, therefore, to be rewarded as one who had kept the divine law, would be directly contrary to righteousness." "Human judges inquire not [about the] repentance of the robber or murderer, but respecting his guilt."

From these passages does it not appear as if the Editor were of opinion that it is quite right and proper to apply human reason as a standard, by which to judge what must be the will of God, when he thinks it supports his views of the ways of Providence; but that, on the contrary, it is blasphemous

Digitized by Google

and rebellious against the divine majesty, to deduce from human reason conclusions from the scriptures contrary to his interpretations of them? The Editor has not attempted to dispute that, applied to human affairs, the motive to which he assigns the will of God, in ordaining the death of Jesus on the cross, would be palpably iniquitous. Should not this induce him to pause, and permit nothing but the most express and positive declaration, couched in language not capable of being explained in a metaphorical sense, to sway him to a belief so irreconcilable to common sense? Yet he is willing to assume, at once, this conclusion, on the bare fact that Jesus was provided with a body.

Do not orthodox divines often offer it as a reason for the necessity of an atonement being made for the crimes of men, that it would be inequitable, in the perfect nature of the just God, to remit sin without some sort of punishment being inflicted for it as a satisfaction to his justice? Do they not, in consequence, represent the death of Jesus *as an atonement* for the sins of *mankind?* If they do, and are allowed to do so, I think myself also authorized to urge, in reference to human notions of justice, that "it would be a piece of gross iniquity to afflict one innocent being, who had all the human feelings, and who had never transgressed the will of God, with the death of the cross, for crimes committed by others, especially when he declares such great aversion to it." But if the Editor abandon this mode of reasoning, and confess the unsearchable, inscrutable nature both of divine justice and divine mercy, I am perfectly ready and willing to do the same.

Digitized by Google

The Editor now refers to the prophets, (page 533,) saying, that Isaiah, in ch. vii. "predicting the birth of Christ, identifies his divine and his human nature." As Isaiah vii. 14, and ix. 6, have no relation whatever to the doctrine of atonement, I deem it proper to defer the notice of them to the subsequent chapter on the Trinity.

The Editor, in his next quotation from Isaiah, first introduces ch. xi. [3], "And he shall make him" (Jesus) "of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord;" but my limited capacity has failed to enable me to ascertain what he really means to establish by the quotation of this passage, (page 536.) The Editor was in the course of an attempt to prove the deity and the atonement of Jesus Christ, but the force of truth would appear to have induced him here to cite a verse which, containing such phrases as—"Make him of quick understanding," and "In the fear of the Lord," go to prove his created nature. In like manner I must confess my inability to discover any allusion whatever to the atonement, in his next quotation from Isaiah xix. 19, 20.

The Editor having endeavored, in his former Review, to prove the doctrine of the atonement from the application of the term "Saviour" to Jesus, I noted, in my Second Appeal, that "we find the title Saviour applied frequently in the divine writings to those who have been endued with the power of saving nations, whether in a spiritual sense, by the imparting of the divine will, or by affording temporary protection to them; although none of those saving prophets or princes atoned for the sins of their

Digitized by Google

fellow-creatures by their death;" (page 208;) and that "all those who have been instrumental in effecting the deliverance of their fellow-creatures, from evils of whatever nature, were dependent themselves upon God, and only instruments in his hand." The Editor, though unable to deny this fact, thus turns away the subject; saying, "It surely required but little knowledge to discern, that a man's delivering his country does not elevate him to an equality with God, or, that to overcome an invading enemy is an act totally different from saving sinners from their sins." But the force of truth again makes the Rev. Editor quote here the following passage, ("and he *shall send them* a Saviour, and a great one, and he shall deliver them,") which does not only refute his own position, but proves what I advanced in my Second Appeal; that is, as Christ and others, who saved people at different times in their capacities, were dependent themselves upon God, and only instruments in his hands; is it not possible for God, who could raise, as the Editor confesses, personages to save men, by their miraculous strength, from the grasp of their enemies, to raise one to save mankind from sin through his divine instructions? If not, how should we reconcile such disavowal of the power of God to the following assertion of the evangelist Matthew, that the people "glorified God, who had given such power to men"? (ix. 8.) And if Jesus was not entitled to the appellation of a Saviour from the saving power of his divine instructions, in what sense should we understand those declarations of Jesus himself,

Digitized by Google

to be found even in a single gospel ?—John v. 24, vi. 63, xv. 3.

To his question, "When, previously to Christ's coming, did the Egyptians cry to Jehovah for deliverance, and when, previously, was Israel the third with Egypt and the Assyrians ?" my answer must be in the negative ; that is, neither previous to Christ's coming did the Egyptians cry to Jehovah and join the Assyrians and Israel, a blessing in the midst of the land, nor have they subsequently to the coming of Jesus, up to this day, cried to the God of Israel, or joined Israel and the Assyrians in asking a divine blessing.

The Editor says page (537,) that "in ch. xxxv. the blessings of Christ's kingdom are declared in the most glowing language." I do not dispute it in the least. If verse 10 ("the ransomed of the Lord shall return," &c.) have any allusion to Jesus, it must have reference to his implicit obedience to the will of Jehovah, even to the laying down of his own life for the safety of mankind ; as explained in my Second Appeal, pp. 201, 202. Any one who has a tolerable knowledge of the idiom of Hebrew or Arabic, or even Persian, must be aware that the word "ransom" פריום or فداء is often used to express extreme attachment or obedience, without implying an actual sacrifice as an atonement for sins.

He again quotes Isaiah xlii. [2,] 21, "He shall not cry," &c. "The Lord is well pleased for his righteousness' sake ;" but I am unable, also, to discover what these quotations have to do with Christ's atoning for sin as a sacrifice in lieu of goats and bullocks.

Digitized by Google

So, 2 Corinthians, v. 21, "For he hath made him to be sin," &c. has no reference to the atonement, which the Editor insists upon: it implies no more than that "God hath made him subject to sufferings and death, the usual punishment and consequence of sin, as if he had been a sinner, though he were guilty of no sin; that we, in and by him, might be made righteous, by a righteousness imputed to us by God." See Locke's works, Vol. VIII. page 232.

The Rev. Editor now refers to ch. liii. of Isaiah, laying great stress upon such phrases as the following, found in that chapter: "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows;" "He was wounded for our transgressions;" "The Lord hath laid on him the iniquities of us all;" "He shall bear their iniquities." Do these sentences prove that he, like a sacrificial "lamb" or "sheep," atoned for the sins of others? Did ever a sacrificial lamb or goat bear the iniquities of men? The scape-goats are stated to have borne the iniquities of Israel—a circumstance far from being applicable to Christ, even typically; for he, as was predicted, made no escape from the hands of his enemies. My readers may peruse the whole of ch. liii. and may find that it conveys but the idea that Jesus, as a prince, though innocent himself, was to suffer afflictions, or rather death, for the transgressions of his guilty people, while interceding for them with a king mightier than himself.

To this question of the Editor, "Is not our repentance sufficient to make atonement with the all-merciful?" my answer must be in the affirmative, since

Digitized by Google

we find the direct authority of the author of this religion, and his forerunner, John the Baptist, requiring us to have recourse to repentance as the means of procuring pardon for sin. (Vide page 24.) Had the human race never transgressed, or had they repented sincerely of their transgressions, the Son of God need not have been sent to teach them repentance for the pardon of their sins, to lay before them the divine law, calculated to prevent their further transgressions, the fulfilment of which commission was at the cost of his life.

As I have already noticed (in page 54 et seq. Final Appeal) the Editor's reference to human ideas of justice in support of the doctrine of atonement, and his censuring me for the same mode of reference to natural equity, I will not renew the subject here.

The Editor seems contented with the quotation of only two passages of Jeremiah, viz. ch. xxiii. [5,] "Behold, the days come, saith Jehovah, that I will raise unto David a righteous branch," &c. and ch. xxxi. [31, 33,] as being quoted in Heb. viii. [8, 10,] "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the land of Judah. I will put my law in their inward parts," &c. The Editor then quotes (page 539) 1 Cor. i. 30, "Christ is made unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption." But what these quotations have to do with the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, I am again at a loss to perceive; being able to discover in them nothing more than a prophecy and its fulfilment, that Christ was to be

Digitized by Google

sent to direct mankind to sincerity in worship, righteousness in conduct, sanctification in purity of mind, and salvation by repentance.

The Editor then advances, that "Ezekiel also predicts the promised Redeemer in ch. xxxiv. 23. He says, 'I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; and he shall be their shepherd.'" I never denied, in any of my publications, that Jesus was sent as the promised Messiah, nor did I ever interpret the above passages, as some Jewish writers, that the Messiah would be not only of the race of David, but also of his spirit. How is it, then, that the Editor thinks it necessary to attempt so often to prove the kingdom and redemption of Jesus as the promised Messiah in the course of his arguments in favor of the atonement? He afterwards quotes Daniel ix. 26,—"Shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself." There is no term in the original Hebrew passage answering to the words "*but*" or "*himself*," found in the English version. We find in the Hebrew, ואין לו, "No person or nothing for him;" that is, "Shall Messiah be cut off, and no one be for him." The translators used the term "but," instead of "and," as in the Hebrew, and the term "himself," in lieu of "him." In illustration I shall here cite the same phrase found in other instances, both in the original Hebrew Scriptures and their translation also, in the English version. Exodus xxii. 2, אין לו דמים, "No blood [*be shed*] for him." Numbers xxvii. 4, אין לו בן, "He hath no son." Psalm lxxii. 12, ואין עזר לו, "And him that hath no helper." Daniel xi. 45,

Digitized by Google

ואין עוזר לו "And none shall help him." But, even were we to admit this mistranslation or perversion of the original Scriptures, the words, "Shall the Messiah be cut off, but not for himself," would, to my mind, convey nothing more than that the Messiah should be cut off, not for any guilt he committed himself, but by the fault of his subjects, who contined to rebel against the divine law, though instructed by their intercessor, even at the hazard of his own life.

The Editor quotes Hosea iii. [5,] "After that, [afterward shall] the children of Israel return and seek the Lord their God, and David their King," &c. and Joel ii. 28, "And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy," &c; and also Amos ix. [11,] "In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David which is fallen," &c. Had he been pleased to shew the tendency of these quotations to the proof of the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus, I would endeavor to examine the connexion between them: as he has omitted to do so, and their relation to the question is certainly not obvious, I must spare myself the trouble.

The Rev. Editor says (page 541,) "nor does Obadiah, in his short prophecy, wholly omit the Redeemer's kingdom. He alludes thereto in verse 21: 'And saviours, shall come upon mount Zion to judge the mount of Esau; and the kingdom shall be Jehovah's.'" To justify the application to Jesus of the noun "saviours," though found in the plural form, he thus argues: "should he" (the author of the Ap-

Digitized by Google

peals) "reply, that as the plural number 'saviours' is used, this cannot refer to Christ; we ask him whether he has not (page 242) affirmed, that 'the plural form is often used in a singular sense, as of his masters, meaning his master has given him a wife'"?— The Editor, as a diligent student of the Scriptures, should have known that the noun in question, "saviours" being accompanied with the plural verb ועלו, "they shall come up," is by no means an analogous case to that of the term "Masters," as found in Exodus xxi. 4, which is connected with the verb singular יתן, whereas, in Neh. ix. 27, the term "saviours" is associated with the verb in the plural form and the past tense, as well as with the pronoun plural.

I must, therefore, maintain the correctness of reading "saviours" in Obadiah as required in the former alternative of the question put by the Editor, (page 541, line 34,) finding myself unable to "acknowledge the triune God," as proposed by him in the latter alternative: for having relinquished the notion of the triune, quadrune, and decimune gods, which I once professed, when immersed in the grosser polytheism prevailing among modern Hindoos, I cannot reconcile it to my understanding to find plausibility in one case, while the same notion is of acknowledged absurdity in another. The Editor admits (page 536) the application of the term Saviour to human individuals, as pointed out by me, (Second Appeal, pp. 289, 290,) yet he is anxious to prove the doctrine of the atonement by the application of that very term to Jesus.

The Editor says, (page 542) that "Micah, in ch.

Digitized by Google

iv. describes Christ's kingdom nearly in the same terms with Isaiah, and in ch. v. he repeats the place of his birth: 'Thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, out of thee shall he come forth unto me—whose goings forth have been of old, from everlasting.' The testimony to the eternal deity of Christ, given in connexion with his birth as man, it is wrong to overlook." Any testimony relating to the birth of Jesus, having nothing to do with his atonement, is not in place here; but I will examine the verse here cited in the subsequent part of this discussion, when we come to the subject of the Trinity.

He quotes again Nahum i. 15, for the purpose of proving Christ's kingdom, which is a subject totally foreign to that of the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus. "Habakkuk" (says the Editor, page 542) "was evidently no stranger to the doctrine founded on the atonement;" and he then quotes the passage, "The just shall live by his faith," as corroborated by Paul, Rom. i. [17,] and Gal. iii. 2 [11 ?]; and "The earth shall be filled with the knowledge of Jehovah," &c. But what faith in, and knowledge of God, as well as faith in the perfection of his attributes, and in the prophets sent by him, has to do with the atonement, I am at a loss to discover. Does the bare mention of faith by Habakkuk, or other prophets, prove his or their familiarity with the sacrificial death of Jesus?

He quotes the passage of Haggai ii. [6, 7, 9,] "Thus saith Jehovah;—The desire of all nations shall come, and [I] will fill this house with glory.— The glory of this latter house shall be greater than

Digitized by Google

that of the former, saith Jehovah of hosts,"—which the Editor thinks affords decided proof respecting both the atonement and the deity of Christ. It is, however, too deep for my shallow understanding to discover from this passage an allusion to either of these doctrines, much less that it is a decided proof of them. Were we to understand by the word "temple," in both instances in the verse, a *material* one, which it is evident, from its context in the prophecy, was alone in the contemplation of Haggai, we must be persuaded to believe that the latter temple was more magnificently built by Zerubbabel and Joshua, in the reign of Darius, than the former built by Solomon. Should the *spiritual* temple be understood by the latter term in the above, it would be regarded naturally superior to a material one, without the necessity of "Jehovah's coming into it clothed in our nature."

He quotes Zech. iii. 8, 9, and vi. 12, 13, wherein there is not the slightest mention of the atonement. As to his attempt to prove the deity of Jesus from these passages, I will notice it in a subsequent chapter. The phrase found in the verse ("I will remove the iniquity of that land in one day") does not attribute the removal of the iniquities of the land of Israel to the sacrificial death of Jesus, so as to justify the Editor in quoting it as a proof of the doctrine of the atonement. Besides, the verse can by no means be applied to the death of Jesus, whether vicarious or accidental, since, after the day of his crucifixion, the Israelites, so far from being freed from sins, continued, more vehemently than ever, to pursue sinful

Digitized by Google

conduct in their violent persecution of Christians.—So the Jews have been punished to this day, as Christians believe, on account of their outrages upon the body of Jesus, and their disobedience to him.—The remaining passage of Zech. (pp. 543—548,) and verse 1st of ch. iii. of Malachi, (page 548,) quoted by the Editor in support of the deity of Jesus, I will notice afterwards.

I am sorry I cannot agree with the Editor in his assertion, (page 549,) that "had our Lord himself made no direct declaration respecting the design of his death, his referring his disciples to those predictions already named, would have been sufficient, particularly in their circumstances;" for it would be strange to suppose that Jesus should have omitted to inculcate so important a doctrine, and so fundamental for salvation, (according to the Editor,) both before and after his resurrection, while he was constantly enjoining love to God, to neighbors, and to each other, and also repentance, in case of failure in obedience. How is it possible to think, unless biassed by early prejudices, that a teacher, a truly divine teacher, who, by declaring himself publicly the son of God* and the king of the Jews,* as predicted, brought death upon himself, should have kept concealed the doctrine of the atonement, if such were the main source of salvation, from his own apostles, even after his resurrection, and have left them to deduce so material a point from the obscure predictions of the prophets, which are susceptible of so many different interpretations?

* John xix. 7, 12.

Digitized by Google

The Editor then affirms, that "it is evident that direct intimations of his nature were not withheld: such were, his declaring to them" (his apostles) "that he came to give his life a ransom for many—his conversing with Moses and Elias, (Luke ix. 31,) his declaring that the Son of Man should be betrayed into the hands of men, and be killed, and rise again the third day—that he was about to give his flesh for the life of the world, and to lay down his life for his sheep—and his discourse with them, 'This is my body, which is broken for you;' 'This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins;' 'Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day.'" As the Rev. Editor quoted some of these verses in his former Review, I noticed them in the Second Appeal (pp. 201—203.) Entirely overlooking my observations, however, he has thought proper to repeat them here, with some additions. This is indeed a strange mode of conducting a controversy; but it lays me under the necessity of again adducing my remarks in the Second Appeal on those passages. They are as follows:—

"Do these passages reasonably convey any thing more than the idea that Jesus was invested with a divine commission to deliver instructions leading to eternal beatitude, which whosoever should receive should live forever? And that the Saviour, foreseeing that the imparting of those instructions would, by exciting the anger and enmity of the superstitious Jews, cause his life to be destroyed, yet hesitated not to persevere in their promulgation; as if a king, who

Digitized by Google

hazards his life to procure freedom and peace for his subjects, were to address himself to them, saying, 'I lay down my life for you.' This interpretation is fully confirmed by the following, [passages.] Luke iv. 43: 'And he said unto them, I must preach the kingdom of God to other cities also; for therefore am I sent.' Ch. ii. 47—49: 'And all that heard him were astonished at his understanding and answers. And when they' (his parents) 'saw him, they were amazed: and his mother said unto him, Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? Behold, thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing. And he said unto them, How is it that ye sought me? wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?' Wherein Jesus declares, that the sole object of his commission was to preach and impart divine instructions. Again, he instructed his disciples in the divine law and will, as appears from the following text: "For I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me.' (John xvii. 8.) Jesus, in communing with God, manifests that he had completed the object of his commission by imparting divine commandments to mankind. 'I have glorified thee in [on] the earth, *I have finished* the work which thou gavest me to do.' Had his death on the cross been the work, or part of the work, for the performance of which Jesus came into this world, he, as the founder of truth, would not have declared himself *to have finished* the work prior to his death."—I now beg that the Editor will be pleas-

Digitized by Google

ed to reconcile all the above passages to his position, that the death of Jesus on the cross was the sole object of his appearance in this world, and that his precepts were a mere code of morality inadequate to procure salvation. Had not Jesus disregarded his life, and suffered his blood to be shed, as predicted, in the delivery of the will of the Father, the whole of the Jews would have still remained sunk in superstition, and the Gentiles in idolatry, and there would have been no perfect security for the remission of sins and the attainment of eternal comfort in those sayings. Hence the gracious benefactor alludes to this act of delivery from sins, through divine instructions, even at the expense of his own life, and not to an actual sacrificial death as an equal value or compensation for the sin pardoned, since the New Testament declares that God forgives mankind *freely*, without any equivalent. Romans iii. 24, "Being justified *freely*, (*δωρεαν*, *gratis*) by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ." So Romans viii. 32, 15, 16, 18, confirms the idea of justification by the free grace of God. For the further illustration of this subject, I quote the paraphrase on the above cited verse, (Rom. iii. 24,) by Locke, one of the greatest men that ever lived, and his notes on its different expressions. Locke's Works, Vol. VIII. p. 304, Paraphrase on verses 24 and 25: "Being made righteous gratis, by the favor of God, through the redemption which is by Jesus Christ; whom God hath set forth to be the propitiatory, or mercy-seat, in his own blood, for the manifestation of his (God's) righteousness, by passing over their trans-

Digitized by Google

gressions, formerly committed, which he hath bore with hitherto, so as to withhold his hand from casting off the nation of the Jews, as their past sins deserved."

Note on the word Redemption, verse 24: "Redemption signifies deliverance, but not deliverance from every thing, but deliverance from that to which a man is in subjection or bondage. Nor does redemption by Jesus Christ import there was any compensation made to God, by paying what was of equal value, in consideration whereof they were delivered; for that is inconsistent with what St. Paul expressly says here, viz. that sinners are justified by God gratis, and of his free bounty. What this redemption is, St. Paul tells us, Eph. i. 7, Col. i. 14, 'even the forgiveness of sins.' But if St. Paul had not been so express in defining what he means by redemption, they yet would be thought to lay too much stress upon the criticism of a word, in the translation, who would thereby force from the word, in the original, a necessary sense which it is plain it hath not. That redeeming, in the sacred Scripture language, signifies not precisely paying an equivalent, is so clear that nothing can be more. I shall refer my reader to three or four places amongst a great number: Exod. vi. 6, Deut. vii. 8, xv. 12, and xxiv. 18. But if any one will, from the literal signification of the word in English, persist in it, against Paul's declarations, that it necessarily implies an equivalent price paid, I desire him to consider to whom; and that, if we strictly adhere to the metaphor, it must be to those, whom the redeemed are in bon-

Digitized by Google

dage to, and from whom we are redeemed, viz. Sin and Satan. If he will not believe his own system for this, let him believe St. Paul's words, Tit. ii. 14:— 'Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity.' Nor could the price be paid to God, in strictness of justice, (for that is made the argument here,) unless the same person ought, by that strict justice, to have both the thing redeemed, and the price paid for its redemption; for it is to God we are redeemed, by the death of Christ.— Rev. v. 9: 'Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood.'"

Note upon the word mercy-seat, verse 25: "*Ἱλαστήριον* signifies propitiatory, or mercy-seat, and not propitiation, as Mr. Mede has rightly observed upon this place, in his discourse on God's house."

The Editor fills about a page and a half (a part of 550 and the whole of 551) with quotations from the writings of the apostles, to substantiate the doctrine of the atonement, beginning with Rom. iii. 24, already quoted by me; but as those teachers merely illustrated the sayings of their gracious Master, their writings must be understood with reference only to what had been taught by him. I will, therefore, not prolong the present subject of discussion by examining those passages separately, especially as I have already noticed some of them in the course of the examination of the Psalms and Prophets. Being desirous to shew that my interpretation of these is fully supported by scriptural authorities, I will only refer to a few texts explanatory of the terms sacrifice, ransom, offering, and the taking away the sins

Digitized by Google

of the world, as ascribed to Jesus. Rom. v. 10; Heb. ii. 17; Eph. v. 2; Heb. v. 1, viii. 3, ix. 14, 23, 26; Tit. ii. 12—14; Heb. xiii. 12; Rev. i. 5; Eph. i. 7; Luke i. 77; Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45; 1 Tim. ii. 6.

Now I beg that my reader will be pleased to determine whether it would be more consistent with the context, and with the benevolent spirit of the Christian dispensation, to understand such words literally, and thus found the salvation attainable by Christianity, upon flesh and blood, human or divine; or whether it would not rather be thoroughly reasonable and scriptural, as well as consistent with the religion of Jesus, to take them in a spiritual sense as explained by the apostles themselves.

As the Editor's illustrative remarks upon the atonement (pages 552 and 553) rest entirely on the arguments previously adduced, I will leave them unnoticed, having already examined those in the preceding chapters, except only his queries, "What shall we say to his impugning" (page 253) "the doctrine of Christ's divine and human nature, even after having acknowledged it in chapter the second; and to his ridiculing his intercession?" &c. to which I must reply. It is perfectly optional with the Editor to say for or against any one whatever his conscience may permit; nevertheless I shall, from the dictates of my own conscience, reject absolutely such unaccountable ideas as a mixed nature of God and man, as maintained by the Editor, as I have previously rejected the idea of a mixed nature of God, man, and lion, (নৃসিংহাবতার) in which Hindoos profess their

Digitized by Google

faith. I have not the most distant recollection of acknowledging Christ's divine and human nature, and shall therefore feel obliged if the Editor will have the goodness to point out in what passage of chapter second of my Appeal I acknowledged this mystery. I have never, so far as I am aware, ridiculed, even in thought, the intercession of Jesus for mankind: I therefore hope that Christian charity will restrain the Editor from imputing to me in future such a charge. I only intended to refute the argument adduced by Trinitarians, that no being can intercede with another being for a third one, unless the mediator be possessed of the nature of the being with whom, as well as of those for whom he intercedes.

To this assertion of the Editor, "the blood of no *mere creature* could take away sin," I add the assertion also maintained by the Editor, that "the Creator is not composed of blood and flesh," and leave to him to say, if the blood of Jesus was not that of a creature whose blood it was. It is evident from the circumstance of the blood of a creature being unable to take away sin, and the Creator having no blood, that the taking away of sin can have no connexion with blood or a bloody sacrifice.

The Editor declares, (page 554,) that "no one but Jehovah, the unchangeable God, could atone for sin, justify the sinner, and change his heart: the Father himself witnesses that it is Jehovah whom he hath appointed to this glorious work." "He humbled himself by becoming in our nature the mediator between God and men." Nothing that I can conceive,

Digitized by Google

but prejudice in favor of the Trinity, can prevent the Editor from perceiving gross inconsistency between his declaring Jesus to be the unchangeable Jehovah, and also to have been appointed by Jehovah, according to whose will the former Jehovah humbled himself in becoming in our nature a Mediator. How could the unchangeable Jehovah be endued with a new honor which he had not prior to his appointment by the latter Jehovah? How could the unchangeable God change his condition by assuming a new nature? If the acceptance of a new state of honor, the assuming of a new nature, or the alteration of properties, such as magnitude and other conditions, be not considered as changes in an object, all phenomena may safely, according to the Editor's maxim, be called unchangeable; and consequently the application of the term "unchangeable" being common to Jehovah, and those who are not Jehovah, can imply no peculiar ground of distinction or reverence for Jehovah. The Editor says, (page 555,) "Nor does it" (the Scripture) "give us the least hint that God ever has imparted any one infinite perfection to a finite creature. This, indeed, is impossible in its own nature." I therefore beg to ask, whether or not, on the same ground, it is not impossible, in its own nature, that the whole of the omnipresent God should be brought into a circumference of a small space, subjected to all human feelings, and clothed at one time with two opposite natures, human and divine.

The Rev. Editor, in the concluding part of the subject of the atonement, attempts to prove the infi-

Digitized by Google

nite perfection of Jesus, forgetting, perhaps, the denial made by Jesus himself of omniscience, as well as omnipotence, as narrated in the evangelical writings. He entirely avoids here noticing what I stated in proof of the finite effects of Christ's appearance in the world; which I now repeat, and beg that the Editor will favor me with a reply thereto. My argument is, "That the effects of Christ's appearance on earth, whether with respect to the salvation or condemnation of mankind, were *finite*, and therefore suitable to the nature of a finite being to accomplish, is evident from the fact, that to the present time millions of human beings are daily passing through the world, whom the doctrines he taught have never reached, and who, of course, must be considered as excluded from the benefit of his having died for the remission of their sins." (Second Appeal, pp. 205, 206.) Besides, it is worth observing, that an avowal of the beginning of creation, and of its end, amounts to a proof of the finite number of creatures, however numerous they may be; therefore an atonement even for the remission of the sins of all of them must be of a finite nature.

Should it be alleged that the sins committed by a single individual, in the limited period of his life, though they are finite in themselves, yet are committed against the infinite God, and thereby they are infinite, and that an atonement on the part of an infinite being is therefore necessary for their remission; I shall reply—In the first place, the assertion that the guilt committed against an infinite Being is infinite in its consequences, is entirely unsupported by

Digitized by Google

reason or proof, and is contrary to scriptural authorities; for we find that the Israelites were, from time to time, afflicted with finite punishment for the sins they committed against the infinite God. 1 Chron. xxi. 11, [12]: "So Gad came to David, and said unto him, Thus saith the Lord, choose thee either *three year's famine*, or *three months* to be destroyed before thy foes, while that the sword of thine enemies overtake thee; or *else three days* the sword of the Lord, even the pestilence, in the land, and the angel of the Lord destroying throughout all the coasts of Israel," &c. Ver. 15: "And God sent an angel unto Jerusalem, to destroy it; and as he was destroying, the Lord *beheld, and he repented him of the evil*, and said to the angel that destroyed, It is enough, stay now thine hand," &c. Judges xiii. 1: "And the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord; and the Lord delivered them into the hand of the Philistines *forty years*."

In the second place, were we to admit the truth of this argument, we must, upon the same ground, as far as reason suggests, esteem a good act, done for the honor of the commandment of the infinite God, or a prayer offered to propitiate the Divine Majesty, to be also worthy of infinite reward as its effect. Under these circumstances we cannot help observing, that among those that believe in any revelation, either true or received as true, there is, probably, no man that has not performed, at least, one single righteous act during the whole period of his life; but as he is a mortal and imperfect being, he cannot be supposed to have escaped every sin in

Digitized by Google

this tempting world: every man, then, must be both guilty of infinite sin and an agent of infinite virtue. If we suppose that this very person is to be punished for eternity, according to the Editor, for the infinite sin he has committed, there will be no opportunity of his enjoying an infinite reward for his good work; but, according to the position, he must be either rewarded for his good or punished for his evil actions for eternity, while justice requires that he should experience the consequences of both. Would it be consistent with the perfect nature of the just God, to afflict one with eternal punishment for his guilt, leaving, at the same time, his good deeds unnoticed entirely, though performed with a view to the glory of God? Is it not, therefore, scriptural as well as reasonable, that all men should be judged, after death, according to their good and evil works; and then, that, through the intercession of one who stands as a mediator between God and man, those who have, through Christ, truly repented, shall be admitted to enjoy infinite beatitude by the free bounty of the Father of the Universe, to which they are not entitled by their own merit?

As to such phrases as *everlasting fire*, or *everlasting punishments*, found in the English version, I beg to refer my readers to the original Greek, in which the term αιωνιος, being derived from αιων, denotes, frequently, *duration* or *ages*; that is, "durable fire," or "durable punishments." Besides, they may find the term "everlasting," when applied to an object *not divine*, implies long duration. Genesis xvii. 8: "And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee,

Digitized by Google

the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession," &c. xlix. 26: "The blessings of thy father have prevailed above the blessings of my progenitors, unto the utmost bound of the everlasting hills," &c. Hab. iii. 6: "He stood and measured the earth: He beheld and drove asunder the nations; and the everlasting mountains were scattered, and the perpetual hills did bow." Vide Note in the Second Appeal, page 277.

CHAPTER III.

INQUIRY INTO THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.

Section I.

The Pentateuch and Psalms.

I now proceed to examine the doctrine of the Trinity, a term which although it is frequently introduced both in orthodox writings and conversation, as the fundamental doctrine of Christianity, yet is not once found in any part of the sacred books.

The first position the Editor advances, in support of the deity of Jesus, (page 556,) is, that the angel, who is said in Gen. xlviii. 16, to have redeemed Jacob, was Jesus himself, as he appears, "in the Scripture, distinct from the Father and able to redeem," and that the same redeeming being was the angel who spoke to Jacob in a dream, "I am the God of Bethel," (Gen. xxxi. 13:) and appeared to Moses "in a flame of fire, out of the midst of an unconsumed bush," (Exodus iii. 2,) and who came up from

Digitized by Google

Gilgal to Bochim, and said, "I made you go up out of Egypt," &c. (Judges ii. 1,) and called unto Abraham, out of the heaven, and said, "Thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from me," (Gen. xxii. 12,) whence the Editor concludes, that Christ being the redeeming angel, and that redeeming angel being the angel that spoke of himself as God in other instances, Christ is God. The Editor, although he fills more than two pages with this argument, yet never thinks of producing a single authority for his inference, that the angel who redeemed Jacob, was Christ, or for his identifying that angel with those angels whom the Editor considers as Jehovah, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. The only reason he asssigns for his first supposition is, that the angel appeared "distinct from the Father and able to redeem;" hence he was Christ who is represented as the redeemer of his people. Can the circumstance of the performance of similar acts, by two persons, identify one with the other? If so, we must, on the same ground, identify God with the human race, the scriptures having ascribed to them both, such attributes as mercy, wrath, reward, and punishment; and we also, on the same principle, must maintain the identity of Jesus with all those that are said in the sacred books to have redeemed people at different times. Isaiah lxiii. 9: "In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence *saved* them; in his love and in his pity he *redeemed* them, and he bare them, and carried them all the days of old." Ruth iv. 14: "And the woman said unto Naomi, Blessed be the Lord who hath not left thee

Digitized by Google

this day without a *redeemer*,* גאל that his name may be famous in Israel." Neh. v. 8; "We, after our ability, have *redeemed* our brethren the Jews, who were sold unto the heathen."

Were we to admit, for a moment, that the angel who redeemed Jacob was indeed Jesus, it would necessarily follow, according to the Editor, that there was Christ-man-Jesus, God-Jesus and Angel-Jesus; that is, that Christ is possessed of a three-fold nature, and that he is to be esteemed as an obedient servant in his human capacity, as a faithful messenger in his angelical nature, and as an independent master and employer in his divine essence!

If it be alleged that the term angel is here only figuratively applied to Jesus, I shall reply, that we find nothing in the verse that can prevent the application of the term "angel" to the angel of God, in its literal sense; no one, under such a circumstance, can be justified in adopting a metaphorical meaning; nevertheless we will, in conformity to the spirit of the sacred writings, maintain the opinion that God is the only true redeemer, and that his Christ, his angels, and his prophets, are redeemers in a secondary sense; that is, they are the instruments in the hand of God in his works of redemption. If the scriptures do not scruple to call angels, like Jesus, "Gods," and "Sons of God," in a metaphorical sense, we

* In the English Bible the term kinsman is here employed. This, however, is inaccurate, which will appear by referring to the context. It is thereby made evident, that, before the birth of this son, Ruth and Naomi had Boaz and others as their kinsmen, and therefore the expression, "who hath not left thee this day without a kinsman," cannot have reference to the child then born. Besides, the synonymous term, "restorer of thy life," used in verse 15th for the child, sufficiently determines the meaning.

Digitized by Google

should not wonder if we find the term "redeemer" applied to any angel of God, in an inferior sense.—Psalm xcvii. 7: "Worship him, ye gods." Judges xiii. 21, 22: "Then Manoah knew that he was an angel of the Lord, and Manoah said unto his wife, We shall surely die, because we have seen God."—Job i. 6: "The sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord." As to his latter supposition, that the angel who redeemed Jacob was the same that appeared to him in a dream, and to Abraham and to others, on different occasions, the Editor neither attempts to assign reasons, nor does he endeavor to shew any authority for his assertion. He might, perhaps, lay stress on the definite article prefixed to the word "angel," in several of these instances, in the English version, (which he cannot do without total disregard to the idiom and use of the Hebrew language,) and thereby might attempt to substantiate the identity of one angel with the other. He would, however, in this case, soon perceive his own error, if he should refer to Judges xiii. 16, where *the* angel (with the definite article in the common version) says to Manoah, "Though thou detain me, I will not eat of thy bread: and if thou wilt offer a burnt-offering, thou must offer it unto the Lord," declaring himself unworthy of the worship due to God alone; or if he should turn to 2 Samuel xxiv. 16, where the angel is represented as an obedient messenger of God, a destroying instrument in the hands of Jehovah. Many other instances might be cited of a similar nature. How, then, can Jesus, if he be the being termed *the* angel, speak of him-

Digitized by Google

self, (as the Editor supposes,) as God in one instance, while in others he renounces his own deity, and even declares, that he destroys the lives of thousands by the command of a superior being?

Let us now examine whether or not the prophets, as well as the angels of God, in the delivery of his message and his will, did not often speak in behalf of God, as if God himself had spoken. I confine my notice to the prophets; for were I to point out any angel speaking in behalf of Jehovah, without distinction of persons, the Editor might attempt to deduce, from this very circumstance, that that angel was God the Son.

Instances similar to the following abound in the Old Testament. Isaiah x. 4—7: "Without *me* they shall bow down under the prisoners, and they shall fall under the slain. For all *this his* anger is not turned away, but his hand is stretched out still. O Assyrian, the rod of mine anger, and the staff in their hand is my indignation. I will send him against an hypocritical nation, and against the people of my wrath will I give him a charge to take the spoil, and to take the prey, and to tread them down like the mire of the streets. Howbeit *he* meaneth not so, neither doth his heart think so; but it is in his heart to destroy and cut off nations not a few." Ch. xxix. 1, [1—3]: "Wo to Ariel, to Ariel, the city where David dwelt! add ye year to year; let them kill sacrifices; yet I will distress Ariel, and there shall be heaviness and sorrow: and it shall be unto me as Ariel. I will camp against thee round about, and will lay siege against thee with a mount, and I

Digitized by Google

will raise forts against thee." Micah iv. 13: "Arise and thresh, O daughter of Zion, for I will make," &c. Ch. v. 1: "Now gather thyself in troops, O daughter of troops; he hath laid siege against us: they shall smite the judge of Israel with a rod upon the cheek. But thou, Beth-lehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me, that is to be ruler in Israel," &c. Now, I presume, the Editor will not propose to identify these prophets with the Deity; yet he must admit that his argument, if it have any weight at all, must force us to submit to that monstrous conclusion.

In the course of this argument, the Rev. Editor asserts, that "Christ also, in John viii. declares himself to be precisely what Jehovah declares himself in Exodus iii. 14: 'Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, *I am* hath sent me unto you.'— John viii. 24: 'If ye believe not that I am (*he* being supplied) ye shall die in your sins;' and ver. 58, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was, I am.'" How is it possible that the Editor, a diligent student of the Bible for thirty or forty years, can have made such a palpable mistake as to assert, that the declaration of Jehovah, in Exod. iii. and that of Jesus, in John viii. are *precisely the same?* It is but his zeal to support the doctrine of the Holy Trinity that can have prevented him from examining the phrases found in these two chapters. In Exod. God says, "Thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel, אהיה אשר אהיה* 'the being who

*אהיה is the future tense of היה to be, which literally implies "I shall be," and is used for "I am," that is, "I am and shall be;" equivalent to the

is being' hath sent me unto you;" a phrase in Hebrew, which implies Him who alone can be described as only mere being or existence, and which is translated in the Greek Septuagint, though not* very correctly, εγω ειμι ὁ ων, "I am the being." But in the Gospel of John (viii. 24) the words are, "I am," (*he* or *Christ*,) and in the original Greek, εγω ειμι, "I am," without the addition of ὁ ων, "the being," as is found in the Septuagint. In the Hebrew translation of John viii. 24, אני הוא, or "I he," is found. So, in ver. 58, we find only εγω ειμι, or "I am." In John viii. 24, the word Χριστος is of course supplied in comparing with Matthew xxiv. 5, "I am Christ," and with John iv. 25, 26. I would then ask, is אהיה אשר אהיה, or "the being who *is* being," a phrase precisely the same with εγω ειμι, or "I am"? If so, it must require a mode of argument to prove it, equally beyond my comprehension with the mysterious doctrine of the Trinity, which it is brought to support.

From the circumstance of Jesus having announced, "Before Abraham was, I am," (ver. 58,) the Editor concludes, that "the Jews at once understood him to declare himself God, and took up stones to stone him; nor did Jesus hint that they had mistaken him;" —a silence which the Editor thinks amounts to the tacit acknowledgment by Jesus of his deity. But

"eternal being." The Jews consequently count this term among the names of God, as is evident from its being used in agreement with a verb in the third person, as in the above-cited verse.

* I say not very correctly, because we find in the Septuagint, the term אהיה, rendered ὁ ων, or the being, in one instance, and εγω ειμι in lieu of the same term אהיה in the other.

from the context of ver. 58, it appears clearly that the indignation of the Jews arose from the idea that Jesus declared himself not merely the contemporary of Abraham, but even gave out that before Abraham, he was; and that it was for this they attempted to stone him. It is not the only instance in which Jesus left the Jews to labor under a misconception of his meaning, for we find the same to have been the case in several other instances. Thus, John ii. 19—21: "Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. Then said the Jews, forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou rear it up in three days? But he spake of the temple of his body." John vi. 53, 66, viii. 26, 27: "I have many things to say and to judge of you; but he that sent me is true: and I speak to the world those things which I have heard of him. They understood not that he spake to them of the Father."

The Editor mentions, (page 559,) that "Job also testifies that the redeemer is God," and quotes Job xix. 25, 26: "For I know that my redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth. And though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God." I fully coincide with the Editor in this declaration. Not Job alone, but all the other writers of the sacred books, testify that the true redeemer is God; and they all expected him to cast his mercy upon them, both at the last moment of their life, and at the last period of the world. I am at a loss to know what expression in the passage in question has induced the

Digitized by Google

Editor to refer to the other texts cited, "would we know whether by God, Job means some inferior deity, neither creature nor creator;" for there can be no doubt that the term redeemer is frequently in the sacred writings applied in its strict sense to the Most High God; and that the phrases, "He shall stand at last," and "I shall see God," which are also found in the above passage, are often spoken of the Supreme Being, without implying any necessity of understanding them as applicable to an inferior deity, either creature or creator. Exodus xxxiv. 5: "And the Lord descended in the cloud, and stood with him there," &c. Zech. xiv. 3, 4: "Then shall the Lord go forth and fight against those nations, as when he fought in the day of battle. And his feet will stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem." Numb. xiv. 14: "That thou art seen face to face." Matt. v. 8: "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." The phrase, "at the latter day," found in ver. 25, is incorrectly rendered in the English version as the translation of the Hebrew אחרון, as has been already noticed in page 44. [Note.]

The Editor refers his readers to Psalm ii. last verse, "Kiss the son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are they who trust in him,"—leaving the context carefully out of sight. I therefore deem it proper to cite the preceding verses here, that the public may judge whether the verse referred to by the Editor be directly applicable to Jesus or to David. David thus relates the circumstance of the

Digitized by Google

hostile disposition of the heathen kings against God and against his anointed David himself, in verses 1—3, and the despite of God at their vain boast, in verses 4—6. He then mentions, in verses 7—9, how God afforded him consolation: "I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto *me*, thou art my son; THIS DAY HAVE I BEGOTTEN THEE. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt *break* them with a *rod of iron*; thou shalt *dash them in pieces* like a potter's vessel." David lastly mentions what God recommended those heathen kings to do for their safety, verses 10—12: "Beware now, therefore, O ye kings; be instructed, ye judges of the earth! Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the son, lest he be angry," &c. Here Jehovah, in verse 7, calls David, "*My son, this day have I begotten thee*," corresponding with Psalm lxxxix. 27, "Also, I will make him (David) my first-born, higher than the kings of the earth." I must again say, that nothing except the violent force of early-acquired prejudice can lead any one to the direct application of the term "son" (found again in verse 12 of the same Psalm, relating to the same subject) to another than David. God again assures David, in verses 8, 9, that he would have the heathen for his possession, and that he would break the heathens and dash them to pieces. So we find in [1] Chron. xiv. 8: "When the Philistines heard that David was* anointed king over all Israel, all the Philistines went up to seek David: and Da-

* Vide Psalm ii. 2, "against his anointed."

Digitized by Google

vid heard of it, and went out against them." Ver. 16, [17]: "David therefore did as God commanded him: and they smote the host of the Philistines from Gibeon even to Gazer. And the fame of David went out into *all lands;* and the Lord brought the *fear of him upon all nations.*" And ch. xviii. 1—8: "Now after this it came to pass, that David smote the Philistines, and subdued them, and took Gath and her towns out of the hand of the Philistines, And he smote Moab; and the Moabites became David's servants, and brought gifts. And David smote Hadarezer, king of Zobah, unto Hamath, as he went to establish his dominion by the Euphrates. And David took from him a thousand chariots, and seven thousand horsemen, and twenty thousand footmen: David also houghed all the chariot horses, but reserved of them an hundred chariots. And when the Syrians of Damascus came to help Hadarezer, King of Zobah, David slew of the Syrians two and twenty thousand men. Then David put garrisons in Syria-damascus, and the Syrians became David's servants, and brought gifts. Thus the Lord preserved David *whithersoever* he went. And David took the shields of gold that were on the servants of Hadarezer, and brought them to Jerusalem. Likewise from Tibhath, and from Chun, cities of Hadarezer, brought David very much brass, wherewith Solomon made the brazen sea, and the pillars, and the vessels of brass." And also ch. xx. 2, 3: "And David took the crown of their king from off his head, and found it to weigh a talent of gold; and there were precious stones in it; and it

Digitized by Google

was set upon David's head: and he brought also exceeding much spoil out of the city. And he brought out the people that were in it, and *cut them with saws, and* [with] *harrows of iron, and with axes.* Even so dealt David with all the cities of the children of Ammon. And David and all the people returned to Jerusalem." Do not such denunciations as, "Thou shalt break them with a *rod of iron,*" "Thou shalt dash them in pieces," found in ver. 9 of the above Psalm, correspond with 1 Chron. xviii. [xx.], "David smote the Philistines;" "he smote Moab;" "David smote Hadarezer;" "David slew of the Syrians two-and-twenty thousand men;" "David took the crown of their king from off his head;" "and cut them" (the citizens) "with saws, and with harrows of iron"? Are not these directly suitable to the history of David, the conqueror, called by God, his son, rather than to the office and nature of the meek and lowly Jesus, who, though most exalted among the sons of God, was himself the victim of the rage of unbelievers? Even upon the Trinitarian system, do not such sentences as "*ask*—I shall give thee the heathen for an inheritance," corresponding with the passages in Chronicles, "The Lord brought the fear of him" (David) "*upon all nations,*" "Thus the Lord preserved David whithersoever he went,"—admit of better application to David, whose glory depended from time to time upon his supplications to God, than to Jesus, who, as God himself, according to the Editor, was possessed of infinite power and glory from eternity, and needed not to ask of another? Does not such address

Digitized by Google

to the heathen kings as "Kiss the son, lest he be angry," &c. agree with the circumstances mentioned in 1 Chron. xviii. [xx.]: "The Moabites became David's servants, and brought gifts;" "the Syrians became David's servants, and brought gifts;" "and he brought out the people—and cut them with saws, and [with] harrows of iron, and with axes. Even so dealt David with all the cities of the children of Ammon"?

The opponents whom David broke "with a rod of iron," were his political enemies; consequently the assertion of the Editor, that "the destruction to spiritual enemies is no where in scripture described as arising from the wrath of a mere creature," has no applicability to the subject in question. As to his assertion, "Prophets denounced on men the wrath of God, and pronounced on them a curse in his name," I only refer the Rev. Editor to 2 Kings, v. 26, 27, in which Elisha is said, when displeased at the conduct of his servant, to have miraculously punished him with leprosy, without pronouncing on him verbally any curse in the name of God; and also to Exodus xxiii. 21, wherein he will find that the angels of God, if provoked, have the power of keeping away pardon from men.

It may, however, be fairly concluded from the authority and acts of Jesus himself, that both the angels and the prophets of God, in performing miracles, either of punishment or reward, according as they were disposed, applied always to God for power, though they sometimes omitted to express such applications verbally. John xi. 41, 42: "And Jesus"

Digitized by Google

(in raising Lazarus from the dead) "lifted up his eyes and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me ; and I knew that thou hearest me *always.*"

From the words, "who trust in him," found in the second Psalm, the Editor attempts to prove the deity of the Son on the supposition that the phrase "to trust in" is exclusively applicable to God, and corroborates his opinion by Jer. xvii. 5, forgetting that this term, though it is often used with reference to God, yet is applied sometimes to created beings. Proverbs xxxi. 11 : "The heart of her husband doth safely trust in her, so that he shall have no need of spoil." Isaiah xiv. 32 : "The Lord hath founded Zion, and the poor of his people shall trust in it." As to Jer. xvii. 5, quoted by the Editor, "Thus saith Jehovah, Cursed be he that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from Jehovah," it, of course, implies that he who trusts in man, independently of God, should be cursed, as appears from the last sentence of the same verse, "whose heart departeth from Jehovah."

The Editor quotes Psalm xxiv. [1, 2]: "The earth is Jehovah's and the fulness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein; for he hath founded it upon the sea, and established it upon the floods," and compares it with John i. 3, "All things were made by him, (the Word,) and without him was not any thing made which was made." The inference which he draws from this comparison is, that "In creating power, Christ is equal to Jehovah." Were we to overlook the mistranslation of this verse* in the

* All things were done by him.] "All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made." Newcome: who explains

English version, (which it is almost impossible not to notice,) and to understand the passage as it stands in the orthodox translation, we should esteem Jesus as the cause of all created things. But we should be in this case naturally inclined to ascertain whether Jesus was an efficient or an instrumental cause of those things; since the preposition "by," found in the verse, signifies either a principal agent of an action, or an instrument therein. We find Heb. i. 2, (as it stands in the English version,) deciding the question beyond a doubt: "(God) hath in these last days spoken unto us by his *Son*, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, *by whom* also *he made the worlds*." Eph. iii. 9: "Who (God) created all things by Jesus Christ." Here all the worlds are represented as made by Jesus as an instrument in the hands of God. It is hoped that after reflecting upon this decision, by the author of these Epistles, the Editor may, perhaps, retract his assertion, that "in creating power Christ is equal to Jehovah," and be of opinion that the world was made by the will of one being. Could not Jehovah, to whom the Editor ascribes omnipotence, create this world independently of another omnipotent being, equal to him "in creating power"? If not, the world must be, in

it of the creation of the visible material world by Christ, as the agent and instrument of God. See his notes on verses 8 and 10. But this is a sense which the word εγενετο will not admit. Γινομαι occurs upwards of seven hundred times in the New Testament, but never in the sense of create. It signifies in this gospel, where it occurs fifty-three times, to be, to come, to become, to come to pass; also to be done or transacted. Chap. xv. 7, xix. 36. It has the latter sense, Matt. v. 18, vi. 8, xxi. 42, xxvi. 6. All things in the Christian dispensation were done by Christ; i. e. by his authority, and according to his direction; and in the ministry committed to his apostles, nothing has been done without his warrant. See John xv. 4, 5: "Without me ye can do nothing." Compare verses 7, 10, 16; John xvii. 8; Col. i. 16, 17: Cappe, ibid. (Improved Version.)

Digitized by Google

this case, the joint production of Jehovah and Christ, as well as of the Holy Ghost, (whom the Editor here omits to notice,) and each of them must depend upon the others in creation, like joint managers of a concern. Can the Editor point out any set of men, or any nation professing a grosser polytheism than this? The only difference that he can show between his notion and that of avowed polytheists, must consist only in respect of the increase or decrease of the supposed number of creators—a distinction which will amount to nothing intrinsic. I must now leave the subject to the sound judgment of my reader.

The Editor further proceeds, saying, "With reference to Christ, Paul adds (1 Cor. x. 25, 26,) 'Whatsoever is sold in the shambles, that eat: for the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof.'" He then concludes, "If this Psalm (xxiv. 1,) then, speak of Jehovah the Father, the same absolute dominion over the earth is here ascribed to the Son as to the Father; if the Son, he is there termed Jehovah."—St. Paul here justifies the eating of whatever is sold in the shambles, referring to Psalm xxiv. 1, as his reason for such justification, without the most distant allusion to Jesus: I am, therefore, at a loss to discover the ground upon which the Editor founds his foregoing conclusion. For further illustration I quote the paraphrase by a most eminent personage on the above verses of Corinthians: "Eat whatever is sold in the shambles, without any inquiry or scruple, whether it had been offered to any idol or no. For the earth and all therein are the good creatures of

Digitized by Google

the true God, given by him to men for their use."—(Locke, Vol. VIII.) If the Editor still insists, in defiance of St. Paul's reference, of common sense, and of the above paraphrase, that in 1 Cor. x. 26, St. Paul alludes to Jesus, I should take upon myself to refer him to Hebrews i. 2, (the Son,) "whom he (God) hath *appointed heir* of *all things;*" and to John iii. 35, "The Father loveth the Son, and *hath given all things* into his hand." These I hope will convince him that all the power and possession of the Son, in heaven and on earth, are derived from the gift of the Father of the universe.

The Editor quotes 1 Cor. x. 22: "Do we provoke the Lord to jealousy? Are we stronger than he?" whence he infers that "the Lord then is capable of being provoked by the worship of idols equally with God." Granting that St. Paul means Jesus by the term "Lord," and by the pronoun "he," in verse the 22d, (a position which is unsupported by proof,) we still find nothing in the passage elevating Jesus to equality with his Father. The apostle may, according to the Editor's interpretation, be supposed to have prohibited Christians from provoking Christ to jealousy, by partaking of the cup and table of devils, instead of those of Christ, of which their Master required them to partake, as appears from the immediately preceding verse—"Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils. Ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils." Is it not natural that Jesus, who enjoined the apostles to observe the Lord's Supper, would be provoked to jealousy by his followers' partaking both

Digitized by Google

of his table, and of the sacrifice offered to idols, without his thereby equalizing himself with God?—I find that the prophets of God are declared in more pointed terms to have been jealous of the dishonor manifested to God; but no one has ever felt disposed to ascribe to them equality with his Divine Majesty. 1 Kings xix. 10: "And he said, I have been very jealous for the Lord God of hosts; for the children of Israel have forsaken thy covenant, and thrown down thy altars," &c.

I will repeat *verbatim* the Editor's quotation of Psalm xxiv. 8, and Eph. iv. 8, and his inference of the deity of Jesus, from the comparison of the one with the other, that my reader may perceive how violently prejudice can operate upon the human mind. He says, (page 561,) that "in verse 8th, one is about to enter heaven as the king of glory; who is called 'Jehovah,' mighty in battle." In Eph. iv. "Jesus, *elsewhere* styled the Lord of glory, ascends, having led captivity captive, which implies battle and victory.* Here, also, the Son is either described as equal in might to Jehovah, or as Jehovah himself." There are not in verse eighth, nor in the whole Psalm xxiv. such phrases as "captivity captive," or "ascend on high," as found in Eph. iv. 8; nor are there, in the whole chap. iv. of Ephesians, the terms "king of glory," or even "Lord of glory," or "mighty in battle," as we find stated in the above Psalm. The Psalm commences by a declaration of God's sove-

* This term, "to lead captivity captive," is not synonymous to "mighty in battle," nor equivalent in application. For one may be mighty in battle without leading captives; so one may lead captive, by miraculous or artful means, without being mighty in battle.

Digitized by Google

reignty over the earth—proceeds to state the virtues that must belong to those who seek his presence and desire his blessing—and concludes with an exhortation to Jerusalem to receive him as the king of glory—the Lord of hosts. But the subject of the above verse of the Epistle to the Ephesians, is Jesus, who ascended on high to give divine gifts to men, after he had *descended first into the middle of the grave*, as is evident from the immediately following verse: "Now that he ascended, what is it, but that he also *descended* first *into the lower parts of the earth*," and so on; a descent which cannot be ascribed to God. Eph. iv. 8, is an obvious reference to Psalm lxviii. 18, a fact which is acknowledged even by Mr. Brown and Mr. Jones, and many other Trinitarian writers: "Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive, thou hast received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them." But the Editor omits here to compare the passage in Ephesians with the last-mentioned Psalm, though both contain almost the same words that he dwells upon; perhaps in consideration of the latter phrases of the Psalm being inconsistent with his object. "Thou *hast received gifts* for men, that *the Lord God might dwell among them*," which clearly shews the subordination of the Son to his heavenly Father. In further explanation, I repeat the note of Mr. Locke, on verses 9 and 10 of Ephes. in his paraphrase of this Epistle, page 477. Note on verses 9, 10: "St. Paul's argumentation, in these two verses, is skilfully adapted to the main design of his Epistle. The converted Gentiles were attack-

Digitized by Google

ed by the unconverted Jews, who were declared enemies to the thoughts of a Messiah that died. St. Paul, to enervate that objection of theirs, proves, by the passage out of the Psalms, (v. 8,) that he must die and be buried. Besides the unbelieving Jews, several of them that were converted to the Gospel, or at least, professed to be so, attacked the Gentile converts on another ground, persuading them that they could not be admitted to be the people of God, under the kingdom of the Messiah, nor receive any advantage by him, unless they were circumcised, and put themselves wholly under the Jewish constitution. He had said a great deal, in the three first chapters, to free them from this perplexity, but yet takes occasion here to offer them a new argument, by telling them that Christ, the same Jesus that died, and was laid in his grave, was exalted to the right hand of God, above all the heavens, in the highest state of dignity and power, that, he himself being filled with the fulness of God, believers, who were all his members, might receive immediately from him, their head, a fulness of gifts and graces, upon no other terms, but barely as they were his members."

After having compared Psalm xxxvi. 6, "O Jehovah, thou preservest man and beast," with Col. i. 17, "By him (by Jesus) all things consist," and with Hebrews i. 3, "He upholds all things by the word of his power," the Editor thus concludes, "The Son, then, is either equal to Jehovah in preserving power, or Jehovah himself." In the first place, in some ancient manuscripts, instead of "by

Digitized by Google

him all things consist," there is the phrase "all things are united in him," which of course bears no comparison with the above Psalm, "O Jehovah, thou preservest man and beast." In the second place, he may perceive from the context, that by the term "all things," the apostle could have meant only the things concerning the Christian dispensation; for we find, in the verse immediately following, Jesus is declared to be "the head of the body, the church," and in the preceding verse,* "the things" are enumerated as orders and ranks in the religious and the moral world, and not natural substances. In the third place, admitting even the interpretation of the Editor, that all natural substances consist by Jesus, we cannot help yielding conviction to the repeated avowal of Jesus, manifesting that the support of all things, or the things of the new dispensation by Jesus, is entirely owing to the power vested in him by the Father of all things,

* "That the apostle does not here intend the creation of natural substances, is evident; for 1st, He does not say, that by him were created heaven and earth, but things in heaven and things on earth; 2dly, He does not, in descending into detail, specify things themselves, viz. celestial and terrestrial substances, but merely states of things, viz. thrones, dominions, &c. which are only ranks and orders of beings in the rational and moral world; 3dly, It is plain, from comparing ver. 15 and ver. 18, that Christ is called the first-born of the whole creation, because he is the first who was raised from the dead to an immortal life; 4thly, The creation of natural objects, the heaven, the earth, and sea, and all things therein, when they are plainly and unequivocally mentioned, is uniformly and invariably ascribed to the Father, both in the Old Testament and in the New. Hence, it follows, that the creation, which the apostle here ascribes to Christ, expresses that great change which was introduced into the moral world, and particularly into the relative situation of Jews and Gentiles, by the dispensation of the gospel. This is often called creation, or the new creation, and is usually ascribed to Jesus Christ, who was the great prophet and messenger of the new covenant. See Eph. i. 10, ii. 10—15, iii. 9, iv. 24; Col. iii. 10; 2 Cor. v. 17. This great change the apostle here describes under the symbol of a revolution, introduced by Christ amongst certain ranks and orders of beings, by whom, according to the Jewish demonology, borrowed from the oriental philosophy, the affairs of states and individuals were superintended and governed. See Mr. Lindsey's Sequel, page 477, and Wetstein in loc." . Improved Version.

Digitized by Google

without which, he is totally unable to support them. John xvii. 2: "Thou hast *given him*" (the Son) "power over all flesh." Ch. v. 30: "I *can* of mine ownself *do nothing*," &c. As to the term "all things," τα παντα found in Heb. i. 3, just quoted by the Editor, it signifies also, all the things belonging to the Christian dispensation, as I observed before. But if the Editor again insists upon his mode of interpretation, as meaning all natural objects by that term, he, by referring to John xiv. 24, "The *word* which ye hear *is not mine but the Father's*," and Matt. xxviii. 18, "*All power is given unto me* in heaven and on earth," must be convinced that the word of power, by which Jesus upholds or rules all things, is, in fact, belonging to the Father.

In his attempt to prove the deity of Jesus, the Editor repeats (page 561) Psalm xlv. 6, as quoted in Heb. i. 8, "Thy throne, O *Jehovah*, is forever and ever." My reader may observe, that to apply to Jesus the term "Jehovah," the peculiar name of God, the Editor perverts the verse in question by placing the word "Jehovah" instead of "God," a term which is in the Scriptures commonly used, not only for the Creator, but for other superior existences. He, at the same time, neglects entirely the original Psalm, in Hebrew אלהים, "Thy throne, O God," and also the original Epistle to Hebrews in Greek Θεος, "The throne of thee, O God." I now beg to ask the Editor to let me know his authority for this unaccountable change. I should, for my own part, be indeed very sorry and ashamed of my opinions, if I found myself compelled to make

Digitized by Google

perversions of scriptural passages, and to set aside the suggestions of common sense, to support the doctrines that I may have been persuaded to profess. It is again worth observing, that the Editor quotes the above passage of Psalm xlv. omitting entirely to notice my remarks on it in the Second Appeal. I am, therefore, induced to repeat them, in the hope that he may reply to them, and adopt a regular mode of argumentation. After stating that Moses was also called God in [the] Scriptures, I thus proceed: "On what principle, then, can any stress be laid in defence of the deity of the Son, in the prophetic expression quoted in Hebrews from Psalm xlv. 6, 'Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever'; especially when we find, in the very next verse, words that declare his subordinate nature, 'Thou lovest righteousness and hatest wickedness, therefore God, *thy God*, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above *thy fellows*?' " (Page 170.) "But it deserves particularly to be noticed, in this instance, that the Messiah, in whatever sense he is declared God, is, in the very same sense, described in verse 7, ('God thy God,') as having a God *superior to him*, and by whom he was appointed to the office of Messiah." (Page 285.)

In the third place, no scripturalist ever hesitated to apply Psalm xlv. directly to Solomon, after his marriage with the daughter of Pharaoh, as is evident from the context: "My heart is inditing a good matter: I speak of the things which I have made touching the king: my tongue *is* the pen of a ready writer. Thou art fairer than the children of men:

Digitized by Google

grace is poured into thy lips: therefore God hath blessed thee forever. Thy throne, O God, *is* forever and ever: the sceptre of thy kingdom *is* a right sceptre. Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness: therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows. Kings' daughters *were* among thy honorable women: upon thy right hand did stand the queen in gold of Ophir. Hearken, O daughter, and consider, and incline thine ear; forget also thine own people, and thy father's house: so shall the king greatly desire thy beauty; for he *is* thy Lord, and worship thou him. Instead of thy fathers shall be thy children, whom thou mayest make princes in all the earth." If the application of the word "God" in an accommodated sense, entitle Jesus to deity, how much more properly should the direct application of the same word, "God," to Solomon, according to the Editor, exalt him to a participation in the divine nature?

The Editor afterwards quotes, in defence of the deity of Jesus, Psalm cii. 25—27, referred to by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. (i. 10—12.) "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thy hand. They shall perish; but thou remainest: and they all shall wax old as doth a garment: and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail." The construction here admits of two interpretations: one is, that verses 10—12, are in continuation of verses 8, 9, addressed to the Son by God, as supposed by the Editor: the other is, that

Digitized by Google

the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews invokes his Divine Majesty by quoting Psalm cii. 25—27, after he has, in the preceding verse, introduced the name of God, as anointing the Son above his fellows, to shew the continual duration of the honor bestowed on the Son, as flowing from the unchangeable and preserving power of the bestower of that honor.—To ascertain which of these two interpretations the apostle had in view, let us now refer to the context. One's exaltation above his fellows by another, on account of his merit, as stated in the preceding verse, (9,) is quite inconsistent with the immutable character mentioned in verses 10—12, and, therefore, these two opposite qualities can by no means be ascribed to the same being. Again, in the following verse, (13,) the apostle, to prove the superiority of the Son over angels, asks, "To which of the angels said he, at any time, Sit on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool"? Here common sense dictates, that if such expressions as "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth," &c.; "As a vesture shalt thou fold them up;" and "Thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail," had been meant by the apostle as applicable to Jesus, he would not, in setting forth the dignity of the Son, have added the words, "Sit on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool;" which imply a much inferior nature to that attributed in the preceding passage, and which, indeed, may be paralleled by other expressions found in Scripture, applied to *mere human* beings. Deut. xxxii. 10: "He (Jehovah) kept him as the *apple of his eye*." Isaiah

Digitized by Google

xlix. 16: "Behold, I have graven thee upon *the palms of my hands.*" Psalm xlvii. 3: "He (Jehovah) shall subdue the people under *us*, and the nations under *our* feet." In describing the superior courage and strength of a man who is reported to have overpowered a lion, and also a dog, no one endued with common sense would, after stating the former fact, adduce the latter as an additional proof of courage and strength, as it is evident that to kill a dog is a feat by no means of so wonderful a nature as that of overcoming a lion. My reader may recollect Matt. xxii. 45: "If David then call him (the Messiah) Lord, how is he his son?" which tells us that Jesus disproves the assertion of the Messiah being the son of David, on the ground that no father could consistently call his son "Lord," much less could he apply to his son the term "my Lord." Were we to admit the first interpretation, upheld by the Editor, and to consider the passage, "Thou, Lord, in the beginning," &c. as a part of the address of Jehovah to Jesus, we must, in conformity to the argument used by Jesus himself, in Matt. xxii. 45, relinquish the commonly-received doctrine, that Jesus is the Son of God, and actually admit his superiority to the Father of the universe, who, according to the Editor, addresses him as "Lord" in Hebrews i. 10. Either, therefore, the Editor must abandon the opinion that God the Father addresses Jesus as Lord, in the passage referred to, or he must cease to consider him as the "Son of God."

The Editor again uses the word Jehovah in verse 10, and reads, "Thou, Jehovah, in the beginning,"

Digitized by Google

&c. instead of "Thou, Lord, in the beginning," &c. without assigning any reason for his deviating from the English version, as well as the Hebrew and Greek originals. For in the original Hebrew there is no "Jehovah" mentioned in Psalm cii. 25, and, consequently, in the Greek passage, Heb. i. 10, which is a quotation of the same verse of the above Psalm, the term κυριε cannot be supposed to be intended as a translation of the word Jehovah. So in the English version the verse stands thus, "Thou, *Lord*, in the beginning," &c. I shall, however, feel obliged to the Rev. Editor, if he can point out to me any authority for his substitution of the word "Jehovah" for Lord, in the verse in question.

With a view to weaken the strength of the evidence found in 1 Cor. xv. 24, as to the changeable nature of Christ, the Editor says, (page 562,) "His original throne as Jehovah God, is forever and ever; his mediatorial throne remains for a season, and then ceases." I have already noticed, in pp. 170 and 277 of the Second Appeal, and in the foregoing chapter of this work, that the term *forever*, or similar terms, when used for a creature, or a begotten son, signify, in scriptural idiom, long duration of time. My reader, therefore, by referring to those instances, will be convinced, that neither Solomon, to whom Psalm cii. 25, is directly applied, nor Jesus, to whom the apostle applies the said verse in the above Psalm, in an accommodated sense, can be supposed to be endued with a throne or kingdom that never will cease;—a question which St. Paul decides in the most plain and positive terms, in 1 Cor. xv. 24, 25: "Then

Digitized by Google

cometh the end, when he shall have *delivered up the kingdom* to God, even the Father; when he shall have laid down all rule and all authority and power For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet." (Ver. 28.) And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the *Son also himself* be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." Here the apostle declares, that Jesus will in the end *deliver up his kingdom* to God *the Father*, and not to God composed (as the Editor maintains) of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and that the Son himself, unlimited to any particular capacity, whether mediatorial, human, or divine, shall be subject to the Father, that God alone may be all in all. Is there in this passage, or in any other part of the scriptures, any authority for saying that the Son's mediatorial throne *alone* shall be delivered up to the Father? On the contrary, neither he nor any one, can in a mediatorial capacity exercise a kingdom; but Jesus, as the king of our faith, the anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows, has a kingdom and throne, and that kingdom only can he deliver up in the end of the world, that God may be all in all. Besides, the above verse (28) asserts, that he, as the *Son*, the highest title that Jesus is honored with, will be subject to him who has exalted him above all creatures. No one, besides, unbiassed by early prejudice, can ever venture to pronounce such an opinion as, that a being can lose his kingdom in any capacity whatsoever, and yet be unchangeable.

Digitized by Google

As some orthodox divines had attempted to prove the deity of Jesus from the circumstances of the term "sheperd" being applied to God, in Psalm xxiii. [1,] and to Jesus, in John x. 16, I pointed out (pp. 290, 291 of the Second Appeal,) that the same term "shepherd" is used for Moses, (in Isaiah lxiii. 11, "With the shepherd of his flock,") and for the leaders of Israel, (Jer. xxiii. 4, "I will set up shepherds over them,) yet that none of those persons is supposed to have been united with God.

The Rev. Editor, although he acknowledges the accuracy of my above assertion, yet tries to draw from it an argument against me by means of one or two strange questions. One is, (page 562,) "But did he" (the author) "never read of a chief shepherd, who, when he shall appear, will give the under shepherds a crown of glory?" The other is, "But was our author ignorant that David was also one of Christ's fold, and Moses and Abraham?" In answer to which, I must confess that I am ignorant of David, Moses, and Abraham, having been of Christ's fold: and although Jesus is styled "a chief shepherd," yet such avowal of his superiority above other messengers of the Deity neither places him on a level with Jehovah, nor does it prove his unity with the Most High God. Can a chief among the generals of a king, be ever supposed equal to, or identified with, the king, his employer? With respect to the argument founded on referring to Jesus Christ, Ezek. xxxiv. 23, "I will set one shepherd, even my servant David," I observed in my Second Appeal, (page 291,) that, even in this case, "they must still attrib-

Digitized by Google

ute his shepherdship over his flock to divine commission, and must relinquish the idea of unity between God the employer, and the Messiah his servant." To which the Editor makes reply, "We must relinquish a unity of nature between the Divine Father and the Messiah whom he sent, just as much as we do between Cyaxares and Cyrus, employed to lead his armies, between Vespasian and Titus, between George the Third and his son, now George the Fourth." In this passage, it must be confessed that we have something like a clear definition or exposition of the nature of the Trinity, in which the Editor professes his belief;—that is, he conceives the Godhead to constitute a genus like angel, man, fowl, fish, &c., God the Son being of the same nature with God the Father, just as the man George the Third is of the same nature with the man George the Fourth, though of a separate will, inclination, and passion, and distinct existence—a conception which is certainly compatible with an idea of unity of nature between the Father and the Son, but which is entirely inconsistent with that of coevality between them; and implies, that, as the difference of existence, &c., between man and man is the origin of the plurality of mankind, so the difference of existence, &c., between God and God, must cause plurality in the Godhead. Can there be any polytheistical creed more clear and more gross than this? Yet the Editor will take it amiss if charged with Polytheism. It is worth observing, that the orthodox, so far from establishing the unity of the Messiah with God by means of the above passage, "I will set one sheperd over

Digitized by Google

them, even my *servant David*," can at most but prove unity between the Messiah and God's *servant David*.

In the course of this argument, the Editor says, that "he had adduced many other passages in which the Son is called Jehovah." I wonder at this assertion. I find hitherto only two places in which he applies the word Jehovah to Jesus, "Thy throne, O God!" &c., "And thou, Lord, in the beginning," &c. The Editor takes upon himself to use the term Jehovah instead of "God" in the former, and instead of "Lord" in the latter instance, as before noticed, and now he gives out his own perversion of those texts as authority!

Mr. Jones having attempted to deduce the deity of Jesus by a comparison of Ephes. iv. 18, with Psalm lxviii. 18, "Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: thou hast received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them,"—I observed, (page 297, Second Appeal,) that, "from a view of the whole verse, the sense must, according to this mode of reasoning, be as follows—The person who ascended on high, and who *received* gifts for men, that the Lord God might dwell among them, is the Lord God,—an interpretation, which, as implying that the Lord God ascended, and received gifts from a being of course superior to himself, in order that he might dwell among men, is equally absurd and unscriptural." The Editor entirely omits to notice the foregoing observation, and only refers to the context, inferring thence that different persons of the Godhead are addressed in the course of the Psalm. (Page 564.)

Digitized by Google

"The Psalm," he observes, (lxviii.) "commences with an address to God in the third person. At verse 7th he is addressed in the second person: the second person is retained till verse 11th, and is resumed again in this, the 18th verse. If one person be not addressed from the beginning, therefore, it is certain that he who ascended on high, identified by Paul as Christ, is God, who went forth before the people through the wilderness." How is it possible that the Editor, a diligent student of the Bible for thirty or forty years, should not know that, in addressing God, the third person and also the second are constantly used in immediate sequence, and that this variation is considered a rhetorical trope in Hebrew and Arabic, as well as in almost all the Asiatic languages, from being supposed to convey notions of the omnipresence and pervading influence of the Deity? To prove this assertion, I could quote a great many instances, even from the single book of Psalms, such as Psalm iii. 3—5, &c. and in a single ch. 2 Sam. xxii. 3, 49, in which God is addressed both in the second and third persons; but as the Editor might, perhaps, allege in these cases, though in defiance both of the idiom of the Hebrew and of common sense, that in all these instances, David in spirit meant the first and the second persons of the Godhead by the variety of persons, I shall quote the translation of some lines of the Qoran, by Sale, and of a Jewish prayer, in which the same variety of persons is used, and where it cannot be imagined that different persons of the Godhead are meant to be therein addressed. Alqoran, ch. I.: "Praise be *to God the Lord* of all creatures,

Digitized by Google

the most merciful, the King of the day of judgment. *Thee* do we worship, and of thee do we beg assistance. Direct us in the right way, in the way of those to whom thou hast been gracious; not of those against whom thou art incensed, not of those who go astray." Can Mohummud here be supposed to have alluded in spirit to the first and second persons of God, or has he not rather used those phrases according to the common practice of the language? The following lines are from a Jewish book of prayers, written in Hebrew, and translated into English.* "*Sabbath morning service.* 'Therefore, all whom God hath formed, shall glorify and bless him; they shall ascribe praise, honor, and glory, unto the King who hath formed all things, and who, through his holiness, causeth his people Israel to inherit rest on the holy sabbath. *Thy* name, O Lord our God! shall be sanctified.' " "*Morning service.* 'His words also are living, permanent, faithful, and desirable forever, even unto all ages; as well those which he hath spoken concerning our ancestors, as those concerning us, our children, our generations, and the generations of the seed of Israel, *thy* servants, both the first and the last.' " A thousand similar instances might be adduced.

In the Qoran, it is further remarkable that the same change of person is adopted when God is represented as speaking of himself. Alqoran, II. 5: "Set not up, therefore, any equals unto *God* against your own knowledge. If ye be in doubt concerning

* Compiled by the Rev. Solomon Hirschell, translated by Messrs. Justins, Barnet, and Joseph, and printed in London by E. Justins, 1808.

Digitized by Google

that revelation which *we* have sent down unto our servant, produce a chapter like unto it, and call upon your witnesses besides *God*, if ye say truth."—Moreover, we find in the Jewish Scriptures, that in speaking of a third party, both the second and the third personal pronouns are sometimes used. Hosea ii. 15—17: "And I will give her her vineyards from thence, and the valley of Achor for a door of hope; and she shall sing there, as in the days of her youth, and as in the day when she came up out of the land of Egypt. And it shall be at that day, saith the Lord, *that* thou shalt call me Ishi; and shalt call me no more Baali. For I will take away the names of Baalim out of her mouth, and they shall no more be remembered by their name." Ver. 19: "And I will betroth thee unto me forever; yea, I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness, and in judgment, and in loving-kindness, and in mercies." The public may now judge what weight the argument of the Editor ought to carry with it, and whether I adduced only a "Jewish dream" in applying verse 18 originally to Moses, or whether the Editor rather has not founded his position on the ground of mere imagination. To me, as an Asiatic, nothing can appear more strange than an attempt to deduce the deity of Jesus from an address by David to the omnipresent God, couched in both the second and third persons. I will, moreover, confidently appeal to the context, to satisfy any unprejudiced person that the Psalmist, in verse 18th, had Moses alone in view.—The Psalm, it will be recollected, was written on the specific occasion of the removal of the ark, which

Digitized by Google

was done according to the instructions delivered to Moses by God on mount Sinai. David accordingly recapitulates, in the preceding verses of the Psalm, the wonderful mercies of God in delivering Israel from the Egyptians, and leading them towards the promised land. In verses 15—17, Sinai is thus mentioned: "The hill of God is as the hill of Bashan; an high hill, as the hill of Bashan. Why leap ye, ye high hills? This is the hill which God desireth to dwell in; yea, the Lord will dwell in it forever. The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels: the Lord is among them, as in Sinai, in the holy place." In verse 18, immediately after mention of the word Sinai, the holy place, he goes on, Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: thou hast *received gifts* for men; yea, for the rebellious also, *that the Lord God might dwell among them*;"—the very reason to which, in the Book of Exodus, the construction of the ark, whose removal was taking place, is assigned. From this it appears evident, that the gifts alluded to were those granted on mount Sinai; and the only question that remains is, Who was it that received those gifts for men? I leave this to be answered by the candid reader. There are, besides, many other passages in the writings of the Psalmist, where David, after addressing the Supreme Father of the universe, abruptly addresses himself to creatures, such as in Psalm lxviii. 28; iv. 1, 2; ix. 5, 6, 10, 11; lxvi. 15, 16; xci. 13, 14. There is nothing, therefore, unusual or strange in applying the verse in question, though originally relating to Moses, in an accommodated sense to Jesus.

Digitized by Google

To prove the figurative application of the term God to Jesus, and to other superior creatures, from the authority of the Saviour himself, I quoted (Second Appeal, page 169) John x. 34, "Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are Gods?" With a view to invalidate this argument, the Editor puts three questions (page 564). The first is, "What creatures of a superior nature are here termed Gods? Those that die like men." To this I answer, Yes; the term "God" is here applied to those chiefs of Israel who were men, and who consequently died like men; and from the very circumstance of their having had the appearance of man, and having been endowed with human feelings, as well as their having been, like men, liable to death, we are under the necessity of inferring that the application of the term "God" to them is figurative, and that it is by no means real, though we find them exalted by the terms, "the sons of the Most High" (Psalm lxxxii. 6*); "the first-born of God" (Exodus iv. 22); the "peculiar people of God, above all nations" (xix. 5); the "kingdom of priests, and an holy nation" (ver. 6); and even by the most glorifying title of "Gods" (Psalm lxxxii. 6). Upon the same ground and the same principle, we must consider (if not biassed by prejudice) the use of the word "God," and "the Son of God," for Jesus, to be figurative, as he himself explained (John x. 34); for although Jesus was honored with abundantly high titles, yet he was in the appearance of man, and possessed of human feelings,

* In the original Hebrew, the word בני, signifying sons, is found, instead of ילדי, or children, as found in the English version.

and liable to death, like those chiefs of Israel, as is evident from the following, as well as many other facts recorded in the Scriptures: "She brought forth her first-born son" (Jesus). (Luke ii. 7.) "And when *eight days* were accomplished for *circumcising* of the *child*, his name was called Jesus." (Ver. 21.) "And the child *grew*, and waxed *strong* in spirit, filled with wisdom, and *the grace of God* was *upon him*." (Ver. 40.) "When he was *twelve years' old*." (Ver. 42.) "And was subject unto them" (his parents.) (Ver. 51.) "Jesus increased in wisdom and *stature*." (Ver. 52.) "The Son of Man came *eating* and *drinking*," &c. (Matt. xi. 19.) "And when he had looked round about on them with *anger*, being *grieved*." (Mark iii. 5.) "Jesus, therefore, being *weary* with his journey." (John iv. 6.) "Now is my *soul troubled*." (xii. 27.) "And began to wash his disciples' feet." (xiii. 5.) "He was *troubled in spirit*." (Ver. 21.) "And being in an *agony*, he *prayed more earnestly*." (Luke xxii. 44.) "And (Jesus) saith unto them, *My soul* is exceedingly *sorrowful, unto death*." (Mark xiv. 34.) "Jesus, when he had *cried again* with a loud voice, *yielded up the ghost*." (Matt. xxvii. 50.) "And became *obedient unto death*, even the death of the cross." (Philip. ii. 8.) Ought not the consideration of the foregoing circumstances relating to Jesus Christ, to have prevented the Editor from inquiring, "What creatures of a superior nature are here termed Gods? Those (Israelites) that die like men? For if the circumstance of being men, and dying like men, must preclude the chiefs of Israel from being supposed to be creatures of a superior nature, notwithstanding

Digitized by Google

they are called *gods*, the highest of all the honorary terms with which any being can be exalted; how can the same argument fail of proving the common humanity of Jesus, who was, like them, in the shape of a man, and died as a man? If the Editor say, that Jesus, though he died like man, yet was raised again from the dead, I shall remind him, that Enoch, one of the sons of men, and Elijah, a Jewish prophet, never tasted death at all, like other men;* that the dead, who happened to touch the body of Elisha, revived and stood up;† and, that a dead boy also was raised by him;‡ and then ask the Editor, are not these circumstances more wonderful than Christ's being raised after death? Is not the fact of Elijah's not having died at all, more conclusive evidence of a superior nature, according to the mode of reasoning employed by the Editor, than the resurrection of Christ after his death on the cross?

In case the Editor should have recourse to the generally-adopted argument, that Jesus was possessed of a two-fold nature, the nature of God and the nature of man; the former, because he is termed God in scripture, and the latter, because he was in the shape of man; I would ask, is there any authority in the sacred writings for alleging that Jesus was possessed of such two-fold nature? A question which, indeed, I took upon myself to put to the Editor in the Second Appeal, (page 252,) but which he has avoided to answer. Are not Moses and the chiefs of Israel termed, in like manner, gods § as well as men? || Did not they perform wonderful miracles,

*2 Kings ii. 11. †2 Kings xiii. 21. ‡2 Kings iv. 34, 35. §Exod. vii. 1. ||Deut. xxxiii. 1; Ezekiel xxxiv. 31.

Digitized by Google

as raising the dead and commanding wind and water,* as well as the sun and moon?† Did not some of them talk of themselves in a manner suitable to the nature of God alone?‡ Are we from these circumstances, to represent them as possessing a two-fold nature, divine and human? If not, let us give up such an unscriptural and irrational idea, as attributing to Jesus, or to any human being, a double nature of God and man, and restrain ourselves from bringing Christianity to a level with the doctrines of heathenish Polytheism. Is it not a general rule, adopted to preserve concordance between all the passages of scripture, and to render them consistent with reason, that when terms, phrases, or circumstances, which are applicable to God alone, are found ascribed to a created being, either man or angel, these are to be interpreted in an inferior sense? Were we to deviate from this general rule and take these terms to be real, Judaism and Christianity would be but systems of Polytheism, and unworthy of adoption by rational beings. Such an attempt as to shew that Moses and the chiefs of Israel having been types and shadows of Jesus, are called gods, is totally inadmissible; for we find no authority in the Scriptures for such an assertion: moreover, had there been any authority declaring Moses and others to have been types of Jesus, it could not depreciate the honor which scripture confers upon them, by the application of the terms "gods" and "sons of God" to them, any more than the fact, that Christ was the Saviour of mankind, in consequence of his having been of the seed

* 1 Kings xvii. 1; xviii. 44, 45, and 2 Kings ii. 22. † Joshua x. 12, and 13

‡Deut. xxvii. 1, xxxii. 1.

Digitized by Google

of Abraham * and house of David, as well as the rod of the stem of Jesse,† could lower the dignity of the Messiah, or could exalt the rank of Abraham, or of David, above Christ.

Such an apology as ascribes birth, growth, and death, to the material body of Christ, and immortality and divinity to his spirit, is equally applicable to those Israelites that are termed gods.

The second question of the Editor is, "To whose nature is their's (Israel's) superior? only to that of the brutes!" In answer to which I refer the Editor to the passages already cited, to wit, Psalm lxxxii. 6, Exod. iv. 22, xix. 5, 6, as well as to Exod. xxv. 8, "God was dwelling among them;" Deut. vii. 6, "That he has chosen them from all the nations," x. 15, "He loved them, he chose them only;" xiv. 1, "They are the sons of God;" and to numerous passages of a similar description, whence the Editor may judge whether Israel was superior to the brutes only, or to the rest of mankind. The third question is, "If other gods die like men, must Jehovah, who made heaven and earth, whose throne is forever?" My answer must be in the negative, because Jehovah is not a man-god that shall die; but he, as the God of all gods, and the Lord of lords, must regulate the death and birth of those who are figuratively called gods, while he himself is immutable. Deut. x. 17: "Jehovah your God is God of gods, and Lord of lords." John xx. 17: "To my God and your God." Psalm xlv. 7: "God, thy God, hath anointed thee."—Let us now again refer

* Genesis xxii. 18. † Isaiah xi. 1

Digitized by Google

to the context of John x. 34. In ver. 33, the Jews assign it as the reason for their attempting to stone Jesus, that he made himself equal to God, by* calling himself the Son of God, as they supposed, in a real sense, which was, according to their law, blasphemy; Jesus, therefore, pointed out to them, in ver. 34, that even the term "god" is found figuratively applied to the chiefs of Israel, in scripture, without meaning to imply thereby, their equality with God; in ver. 35, he reminds them of their applying, according to the Scriptures, the same divine term to those chiefs; and lastly, he shews their inconsistency in calling their chiefs gods, and, at the same time, rejecting Christ's declaration of his being the Son of God, in the same metaphorical sense, as being "sanctified" and "sent" by God. Is not this argument, used by Jesus, an evident disavowal of his own deity, and manifestation of his having called himself "the Son of God," only in a metaphorical sense? I am sorry to observe, that the Editor seems to have bestowed little or no reflection upon these texts.

In answer to my observation on the attempt of orthodox Christians to prove the deity of Jesus from 1 Cor. x. 9, "Neither let us tempt Christ as some of them also tempted," the Editor quotes first, an observation of my own, to wit, "How far cannot prejudice carry away men of sense! Are we not all, in common with Jesus, liable to be tempted both by men and Satan? Can the liability to temptation, common to God, to Jesus, to Abraham, and all mankind, be of any avail to prove the divinity and unity

* As is evident from the reply of Jesus, (ver. 36,) "Thou blasphemest; because I said I am the Son of God."

Digitized by Google

of those respective subjects of temptation?" He then declares, that I was not correct in the statement of my opponent's doctrine on this subject, and denies any one's "having attempted to prove the deity of Christ merely from his being tempted." To shew the accuracy of my statement, however, I beg to refer the Editor to Mr. Jones's work on the nature of Christ. The Editor lastly asserts, that "it is the apostle's declaring that Christ was he who was tempted in the wilderness, and hence, the Most High God, described by the Psalmist as tempted, which is here adduced." But I do not find in the verse in question, nor in any preceding or following verse, "the apostle's declaring that Christ was he who was tempted *by Israel* in the wilderness." If the Editor has met with such a declaration elsewhere, he should first point it out, and then build his argument upon it. But unless he first shew, that being tempted by the devil, and being tempted by Israel, mean the same thing, I cannot admit any relation between the declaration of the apostles and that of the Psalmist.

Relative to Psalm cx. [1,] "The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool," I observed, in my Second Appeal, (page 266) "that this passage is simply applied to the Messiah, manifesting, that the victory gained by him over his enemies, was entirely owing to the influence of God!" To this the Editor replies, "After the Son had humbled himself so as to assume our nature and be appointed to the combat, it was not to be expected that the Father would

Digitized by Google

forsake him. But that Jesus had no might of his own, which our author would fain prove, is not a fact." Is it not most strange, that the Son, whom the Editor considers the *immutable, almighty* God, should be supposed by him again to have *humbled* himself, and to have been *appointed* by another to a combat, in which that other assisted him to obtain success? Are not these two ideas quite incompatible with each other? If such positive disavowal of his *own* power, by Jesus himself, as "I can of mine own self do nothing," "All that the Father giveth shall come to me," has failed to convince the Editor that Jesus had no power of *his own*, no argument of mine, or of any other human being, can be expected to make an impression upon him.

The Editor afterwards endeavors to prove the omnipotence of Jesus by quoting Isaiah lxiii. 5: "Mine own arm brought salvation unto me," and Rev. i. 8: "I am Alpha and Omega; the beginning and the end, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty." Supposing these two last-mentioned passages to be actually ascribed to Jesus, conveying a manifestation of his own omnipotence, would they not be esteemed as directly contradictory to his positive disavowal of omnipotence, found in the foregoing, and in hundreds of other passages? How, then, are we to reconcile to our understanding the idea that the Author of true religion disavows his almighty power on one occasion, and asserts it on another? But, in fact, we are not reduced by the texts in question to any such dilemma; for the passage quoted from Isaiah

Digitized by Google

lxiii. [5]) has no more allusion to Jesus than to Moses or Joshua. Whence, and under what plea, the Editor and others apply this passage to Christ, I am quite at a loss to know. The prophet here speaks of the destruction of Edom and Bozrah, under the wrath of God, for their infidelity towards Israel. These places were inhabited by the sons of Esau, (the brother of Jacob,) who was also called Edom. Gen. xxv. 30: "And Esau said to Jacob, Feed me, I pray thee, with that same red pottage, for I am faint: therefore was his name called Edom." So Jeremiah prophesies the destruction of Edom and Bozrah (xlix. 7 [8]): "Concerning Edom, thus saith the Lord of Hosts, Is wisdom no more in Teman? Is council perished from the prudent? Is their wisdom vanished? Flee ye, turn back, dwell deep, O inhabitants of Dedan; for I will bring the calamity of Esau upon him, the time that I will visit him." Ver. 13: "For I have sworn by myself, saith the Lord, that Bozrah shall become a desolation, a reproach, a waste, and a curse, and all the cities thereof shall be perpetual wastes." And also the whole of Obadiah's Prophecy foretells the slaughter of Edom by the wrath of God. I quote here only one or two verses (8, 9); "Shall I not in that day, saith the Lord, even destroy the wise men out of Edom, and understanding out of the mount of Esau? And thy mighty men, O Teman, shall be dismayed, to the end that every one of the mount of Esau may be cut off by slaughter." Ver. 11: "In the day that thou stoodest on the other side; in the day that the strangers carried away captive his forces, and for-

Digitized by Google

eigners entered into his gate, and cast lots upon Jerusalem, even thou wast as one of them." What expression does Isaiah make use of in ch. lxiii. that the passage can be interpreted as speaking the language of Jesus? Nothing of the kind that I can perceive. It contains rather such denunciations as are considered totally inconsistent with the office and character of the meek and lowly Jesus, the messenger of peace on earth and good-will in heaven towards men. Can the following expressions, "I will tread them in my anger," "Their blood shall be upon my garment," (ver. 3,) be ascribed to Jesus, who so far from treading down the inhabitants of Edom and Bozrah, or of any other land, and sprinkling their blood upon his garment, came to reconcile them to God, and labored in behalf of them, and of all men; even suffering his own blood to be shed, rather than refrain from teaching them the way of salvation? What particular connexion had Jesus with the destruction of the sons of the children of Edom, to justify the Editor in referring ch. lxiii. to the Messiah? I should expect to find such language as is used by Isaiah in that chapter referring to God; for in the poetical language of the prophets, similar expressions are abundantly ascribed to the Most High in an allegorical sense. Isaiah lix. 15—17: "And the Lord saw it, and it displeased him that there was no judgment. And he saw that there was *no man*, and wondered that there was no *intercessor*: therefore his arm *brought salvation unto him*, and his righteousness, it sustained him. For he put on righteousness as a breast-plate, and an helmet of

Digitized by Google

salvation upon his head; and he put on *garments of vengeance* for clothing, and was clad with zeal as a cloak." Daniel vii. 9: "I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow."

As to Rev. i. 8, let us refer to the contexts, commencing with verse 4. In this, John addressing the seven churches of Asia, says, "Grace be unto you, and peace from him which is, and which was, and which is to come; *and* from the seven spirits which are before his throne; *and* from Jesus Christ." He proceeds to describe Christ as a "faithful witness, the first-begotten of the dead, and the Prince of the kings of the earth," adding, "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion forever and ever. Amen. Behold, he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him: and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him. Even so, Amen." Having thus stated what Christ had done, and is to do, John reverts to the declaration of the eternity of God, with which he commenced: "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord; which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty." All this appears so very plain; the eternal attributes of the Almighty, in verse 4, are so distinct from the description of the character and office of Christ in verses 5—7; the identity of the definition of God in ver. 4, with that in ver. 8, is so obvious; that I should have thought it impossible for any

Digitized by Google

[one] not to perceive how totally unconnected verse 8 is with that which precedes it, and how far it was from John's intention to declare the Almighty, and his faithful witness, to be one. Moreover, we find the term "Almighty" in the book of Revelation mentioned seven times, besides in verse 8, and referring *always* to God; at the same time, notwithstanding the frequent mention of the Lamb or Jesus, throughout the whole book, neither the term "Almighty," nor the designation "who is, and who was, and is to come," equivalent to the term "Jehovah," is *once* ascribed to the Lamb. Let the candid reader judge for himself.

The Editor again introduces the subject of the angel of Bokim, (page 565,) quoting Psalm lxxviii. [13,] "He divided the sea, and caused them to pass through, and made the waters to stand in a heap," &c. Whence he concludes that the Son was with Israel in the Wilderness as their God. But what allusion this Psalm has to Christ, situated either in the Wilderness, or in an uninhabited land, my limited understanding is unable to discover. As I have already noticed the argument adduced by the Editor respecting angels, in the beginning of this chapter, I will not renew the subject, but beg my reader's attention to that part of my treatise.

The Editor quotes Psalm xcv. [6, 7,] "For Jehovah is a great God, and a great King above all gods. O come, let us worship and bow down, let us kneel before Jehovah our Maker; for he is our God, and we are the people of his pasture, and the sheep of his hand;" and justifies the application of this pas-

Digitized by Google

sage to Jesus, upon the ground that, in John i. 3, Jesus is declared equally with the Father to be the Maker of all things. I wonder at the Editor's choosing this passage as being applicable to Jesus, on such a basis; for should this reason be admitted as well-founded, all the passages of the Old Testament, in which Jehovah is mentioned, would be interpreted as referring to Jesus without selection. As I noticed this verse of John i. 3, and one or two similar verses in page 91, 92, I will not recur to them here.

Having also noticed Psalm ii. [12,] (page 103,) "Blessed are all they who trust in him," I will abstain from reiterating the same subject, though I find the Editor repeating his arguments here in his usual manner.

To my great surprise I observe that the Editor again quotes John x. 30, "I and my Father are one," to shew that God and Jesus, though they are two beings, yet are one, without any attention to all the illustrations I adduced to explain this passage in the Second Appeal (page 162). I will, however, elucidate this passage still more fully in its proper place. I thank the Rev. Editor for quoting such passages as Psalms lxxxi. 9, 10, and lxxxiii. 18, which, in common with all other authorities of the sacred books, decidedly prove the unity of the Supreme Being, and that no other being, except him, is worthy to be called Jehovah.

In the course of the quotation from the Psalms, the Editor cites Heb. iii. 3, 4: "For this man was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch

Digitized by Google

as he who hath builded the house is worthy of more honor than the house. For every house is built by some man; but he who built all things is God." Upon which he comments, that it was Christ that built the house understood, (as he supposes,) from the phrase "all things" in the verse in question. I will not prolong the discussion by pointing out the errors appearing in the English version. I only repeat verse 6, explaining what the apostle meant by the house of Christ, which the Editor omitted to mention; to wit, "But Christ as a *son over his own house, whose house are we.*" Hence it is evident, that the house which Christ built by the will of the Father is the Christian church; and that God, the Father of Jesus and of the rest of the universe, is the author of all things whatsoever.

SECTION II.

The Prophets.

In introducing the Prophets, the Rev. Editor commences with Proverbs; saying, "If in this book Christ be represented under the character of wisdom, as divines have thought, and as seems implied in Christ's saying, Matt. xi. 19, 'But wisdom is justified of her children;' and Luke xi. 49, 'Therefore said the wisdom of God, I will send them prophets,' fresh proof is here furnished to the eternal deity

Digitized by Google

of the Son." He then quotes Prov. viii. 1, 22, 27, 30: "Doth not wisdom cry? The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. When he prepared the heavens, I was there. I was by him, as one brought up* with him: I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him." It is, indeed, astonishing to me how the strong prejudice of other learned divines, as well as of the Editor, in favor of the doctrine of the Trinity, has prevented them from perceiving that the identification attempted to be thus deduced by them, from those passages of the book of Proverbs, instead of proving the "eternal deity" of Jesus, or his self-existence, would go to destroy his distinct existence altogether; for Christians of all denominations agree that *wisdom*, *understanding*, and all other attributes of God, have been from eternity to eternity in the *possession* of the almighty power, without either or any of them having been endowed with a separate existence; and were we to attribute to each of the properties of God self-existence, we must necessarily admit that there are besides God numerous beings, (his attributes,) which possess, like God himself, eternal existence—a doctrine which would amount to gross Polytheism. But the expression, "The Lord *possessed* me in the beginning of his way," (ver. 22, quoted by the Editor,) proves that the wisdom there alluded to was considered as *in possession* of Jehovah, just as his other attributes are. If Jesus, then, be meant here by wisdom, he must, so far from being esteemed as

* אמון in the original Hebrew does not signify "brought up." It means "steadied," stabled, or established, as qualities with substances. See Parkhurst's Hebrew Lexicon.

Digitized by Google

Jehovah himself, be supposed to have been *possessed by Jehovah* as an attribute. If this doctrine be admitted as orthodox, how then are the primitive Christians to be justified in condemning Sabellius on account of his maintaining the same doctrine? We find that, consistently with the same prophetical language, the inspired writer of Proverbs directs us to call wisdom *a sister*, and understanding *kins-woman*, (vii. 4,) instead of bestowing on her such epithets as, Jehovah, the everlasting God, that are insisted upon by the Editor as properly applied to Jesus. In fact, the book of Proverbs meant only to urge, in the usual poetical style of expression, the necessity of adhering to wisdom, both in religious and social life, strengthening the exhortation by pointing out that all the works of God are founded upon wisdom. If such poetical personifications as are found in the Prophets, as well as in profane Asiatic works in common circulation, were to be noticed, a separate voluminous work would, I am afraid, fail to contain them. And if the abstract attributes of God, such as wisdom, mercy, truth, benevolence, &c. are to be esteemed as separate deities, on account of their being sometimes personified, and declared eternal, and associating with God, this mode of literal interpretation would, I admit, be so far advantageous to the cause of the Editor as respects the refutation of the doctrine of the unity of God, but would not be precisely favorable to the doctrine of the Trinity, as it would certainly extend the number of personified deities much beyond three. Take, for example, the following passages, which personify the attributes of

Digitized by Google

God, and ascribe to them eternity, and association with God. Psalm cxxx. 7: "With the Lord there is mercy, and with him is plenteous redemption." lxxxv. 10: "Mercy and truth are *met* together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other." Numbers xvi. 46: "There is wrath gone out from the Lord." Here we have mercy, redemption, truth, and wrath, all spoken of as separate existences. Are we, therefore, to consider them as persons of the Godhead? As abstract qualities are often represented in the Scriptures, and in Asiatic writings generally, as persons and agents, to render ideas familiar to the understanding, so real existences are intended sometimes under the appellation of abstract qualities, for the sake of energy of expression. In 1 John iv. 8, God is declared to be mere *love.* John i. 1, Jesus is called word, or revelation. 1 Cor. i. 24, 30, Christ is represented as power and wisdom, &c. 2 Cor. v. 21, true Christians are declared to be wisdom in Christ; and Israel is said to be an *astonishment* in Deut. xxviii. 37, and *curse* in Zech. viii. 13; Abraham to be *blessing* in Gen. xii. 2; and Jehovah is declared to be *glory* in Zech. ii. 5. But every unprejudiced mind is convinced that these allegorical terms neither can alter the fact, nor can they change the nature of the unity of God, and of the dependence of his attributes.

After this no further remark seems necessary on the passages quoted by the Editor, from Matthew and Luke, where, as in many other passages in which the word Wisdom is to be found, the sense neither

Digitized by Google

requires, nor even admits, of our understanding Jesus to be meant under that appellation.

The Editor quotes Isaiah vi. 1, 10, relating to the Prophet's vision of God; he then comments, "As this glorious vision, wherein the prophet received his commission, represented either the Father or the Son, we might have expected that it should be the Son, who had undertaken to redeem men." The Editor afterwards quotes John xii. 41, "These things said Isaiah, when he saw his glory and spoke of him," and considers these words as decisive testimony of the opinion, that it was the Son who was seen by the prophet in the vision.

Let us first impartially refer to the context of verse 41 of John. We find in the verse a personal pronoun used three times. The first, "he," in the phrase "when he saw," though understood in the Greek verb ειδε; the second, "his," connected with the word "glory;" and the third, "of him," after the verb "spoke;" thus—"when *he* saw *his* glory and spoke *of him*." The first pronoun, "he," of course refers to Isaiah, mentioned just before it. The second and the third, "his" and "of him," can have no reference to Isaiah, for the words "when Isaiah saw Isaiah's glory, and spoke of Isaiah," could bear no sense whatever. These two last pronouns must, therefore, have reference to some pronoun or noun to be found in the immediately preceding part of the passage. We accordingly find, from the preceding verse, (40,) that these pronouns refer to Jehovah, the God of hosts, mentioned twice in verse 38, whose glory Isaiah saw, and in whose behalf he

Digitized by Google

spoke, without mention of the Son being once made between verses 38 and 41. The passage thus stands, (ver. 38,) He (Isaiah) spoke, "*Lord*, who hath believed our report? and to whom hath the arm of the *Lord* been revealed?" (39,) "Therefore, they could not believe [because] that Isaiah said again," (40,) "*He* hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart;" (41,) "These things, said Isaiah, when he saw *his* glory, and spake *of him*." Isaiah must have then seen the glory of him in whose behalf he spoke; a fact which neither party can dispute; and, as it is evident from the preceding verse, (40,) and from Isaiah vi. [10,] that he spoke of God, who *blinded* the *eyes* of the Jews and *hardened* their hearts, it necessarily follows, that he saw the glory of that very being spoken of by Isaiah. For further illustration of God's being often declared to have blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts, I quote Rom. xi. 7, 8: "What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for; but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were *blinded*. (According as it is written, God hath given them the spirit of slumber; *eyes* that they should *not see*, and *ears* that they should not *hear*,) unto this day." Isaiah lxiii. 17: "O Lord, why hast thou made us to err from thy ways, *and hardened* our heart from thy fear? Return, for thy servants' sake, the tribe of thy inheritance." From vers. 38—41, as already observed, is not a single noun or a pronoun that can have allusion to Jesus. But we find, in verse 42, the pronoun "him," implying the Son as absolutely required by the sense, in reference to verse 37, and in consistence with verse 44,

Digitized by Google

in which the name of Jesus is found mentioned. As all the Pharisees believed in God, as well as in Isaiah, one of their prophets, the text could convey no meaning, if the phrase "Nevertheless among the chief rulers also many believed in him" were admitted to bear reference either to God or Isaiah.

If it be insisted upon, in defiance of all the foregoing explanation, that the two last-mentioned pronouns, in verse 41, "When he saw his glory and spake of him," are applied to Jesus, the passage in the evangelist would be, in that case, more correctly explained by referring it to John viii. 56, "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day," which cannot be understood of ocular vision, but prophetic anticipation; whereas the glory seen in the vision of Isaiah, was that of God himself in the delivery of the command given to the prophet on that occasion, as I observed in the Second Appeal (page 286.) With a view to invalidate this interpretation, the Editor inquires, (page 569,) "What has Abraham's day to do with Isaiah's vision?" In answer to which I must allow that Abraham's day had nothing to do with Isaiah's vision, except that as Abraham saw the day of Christ, (properly speaking, the reign of Christ,) by prophetic anticipation, and not through ocular vision, (John viii. 56,) so Isaiah, as another prophet of God, must have seen the glory of Christ (if he had seen it at all) through the same prophetic anticipation, and must have spoken of Christ's commission (if he had spoken of him at all) through the same prophetic power: the reference, therefore, is one which goes to prove, that whenever the prophets, such as Abraham, Isa-

Digitized by Google

iah, or any other prophets, are declared to have seen or spoken of future events, they must have seen or spoken of them through the prophetic power vested in them by God. I never attempted to prove, that the words "day" and "glory" are synonymous, nor did I declare that Isaiah saw the day of Christ, that the Editor should have occasion to advance that "it is not the day of Christ which the evangelist describes Isaiah as having seen, but his glory." However, I cannot help being of opinion, that in such phrases, on particular occasions, as "He saw the day of the king Messiah," or "He saw the glory of the king Messiah," the words "day" and "glory" amount almost to the same thing. My limited understanding cannot, like the Editor's, discover how "Isaiah fixes the time when he thus saw Christ's glory, even when it was said, 'he hath blinded their eyes,'" &c., for I find the Jews were from time to time charged, by several of the prophets, with disobedience, and with having been blinded and hardened. Deut. xxviii. 28: "The Lord shall smite thee with madness, and *blindness*, and astonishment of heart." xxix. 4: "The Lord hath not given you an heart to perceive, and *eyes to see*, and ears to hear, unto this day." 1 Kings xviii. 37: "Hear me, O Lord, hear me, that this people, may know that thou art the Lord God, and that thou hast *turned their heart back again*." Isaiah lxiii. 17, as noticed before.

The Editor refers to the prophet Isaiah, (pp. 533, 570,) saying, that Isaiah, in ch. vii. "predicting the birth of Christ, identifies his divine and his human nature, 'Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and

Digitized by Google

bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.' This passage the Holy Spirit applies to Christ in Matt. i. 22, 23." He regrets my applying the above verse to Hezekiah, in an immediate sense, though totally unable to reject the proof of such application, deduced by me, in my Second Appeal, from its context, and from the sacred history. He rests his rejection entirely upon the phrase, "A virgin shall conceive," found in the English version, as being used in the future tense, on the ground that "Hezekiah could not have been the child at the time about to be conceived by the virgin, for this plain reason, that God never foretels past things. The birth of Hezekiah was not then a thing to come; for, he was at least six years old when this prophecy was spoken.—This our author will see by merely comparing the fact, that Ahaz reigned sixteen years, and Hezekiah began to reign when he was five-and-twenty years old. Hezekiah must then have been six, if not seven, years old when this prophecy was delivered." The editor, then, charges me with having expended, in vain, 12 pages on this, as well as on the passage in ch. ix. of Isaiah. Here we find again a new instance, in which a diligent study of the Bible, for thirty or forty years, but accompanied with early religious prejudices, has not been able to save the student from making such an error as to take the term הרה, "pregnant," in the original verse, in Hebrew, as meaning absolutely, "shall conceive," and to declare, unthinkingly, that "Hezekiah could not have been the child at that time to be conceived." How will the Editor render the same term הרה,

Digitized by Google

found in Gen. xvi. 11, "Thou hast conceived, or art with child"? Will he, on his adopted principle, interpret it, "Thou shalt conceive?" He must, in that case, overlook verses 4th and 5th of the same chapter, which testify Hagar's having already conceived before the angel of the Lord had seen and spoken to her, in verse the 11th. "He went in unto Hagar, and she conceived; and when she saw she had conceived," &c. (4.) "And Sarai said unto Abraham, My wrong be upon thee: I have given my maid unto thy bosom; and when she saw that she had conceived," &c. (5.) Did not the Editor ever reflect upon Jer. xxxi. 8, containing the same terms הרה, or "pregnant," and וילדת, or "bearing," as are found in Isaiah vii. 14?—a passage which might have suggested to the Editor the propriety of not making so positive an assertion, that "Hezekiah could not have been the child at that time to be conceived." Did the Editor entirely overlook the same term הרה, signifying pregnant, in 2 Sam. xi. 5, and Isaiah xxvi. 17, Gen. xxxviii. 24, 25, Exodus xxi. 22, 2 Kings viii. 12, Amos i. 13? The fact is, that we find in the original Hebrew, העלמה, signifying "the virgin," which, if not referred to a particular person beforementioned, implies, in the figurative language of the Scripture, either a city, or the people of a city, as I noticed in pages 272, 273, and 280, of my Second Appeal; and also we find הרה synonymous with the participle "conceived," instead of "shall conceive." The verse, therefore, thus runs: "Behold, the virgin (the city of Jerusalem, or the nation,) is pregnant, and is bearing a son, and shall call his name Imman-

Digitized by Google

uel." (14.) "For before the child* shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good, the land that thou (Ahaz) abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings," (16,) i. e. Rezin, the king of Syria, and Pekah, the king of Israel, who, at that time, had besieged Jerusalem, as is evident from the preceding verses; and such personifying phrases as "oppressed virgin," and "bring forth children," are found also applied to the city, or the people of the city, in the prophets, in other instances similar to that of Isaiah vii. 14, in question. Micah iv. 10: "Be *in pain*, and *labor to bring forth*, *O daughter of Zion*, like a woman in travail." Isaiah xxiii. 12: "And he said, Thou shalt no more rejoice, O thou oppressed virgin, daughter of Zidon." But unless orthodox authors changed "the virgin" into "a virgin," and "conceived" into "shall conceive," they could not apply the verse in a direct sense to Mary, the mother of Christ, and to Christ himself; and consequently, to suit their convenience, they have entirely disregarded the original scripture, the context, and the historical facts.

In noticing my explanation of the העלמה† "the virgin," in the Second Appeal, the Rev. Editor states, that "It is true, ה, the emphatic of Hebrew,

* In the 17th year of the reign of Pekah, the king of Israel, Ahaz was born; and twenty years old was Ahaz when he began to reign in Jerusalem, and he reigned sixteen years. 2 Kings xvi. 1, 2. Hence it appears, that he lived thirty-six years only; and as Hezekiah began to reign after the death his father Ahaz, when he was twenty and five years old, (2 Kings xviii. 2,) he must have been born when his father Ahaz was ten, or at most, eleven years of age, which was rather contrary to the common course of nature.

† In Isaiah lii. 2, the city, or the people of the city, is once called "a captive daughter;" in ch. liv. 1, it is once styled "barren," עקרה; "a harlot" in Ezek. xvi. 35, and in other instances.

Digitized by Google

is generally rendered in the Septuagint by the Greek article: that they are by no means equivalent in value, however, he may convince himself by referring to that excellent work on the Greek article, for which the learned world is indebted to Dr. Middleton, the bishop of Calcutta." I am really sorry to observe that the Editor should have given such an evasive answer to so important a point; he, however, was obliged to do so, knowing that ה in Hebrew, before a noun, as ل in Arabic, is invariably a definite article. In his attempt to remove the inconsistency between his maintaining the idea of the deity of Jesus, and applying to him verses 15 and 16 in Isaiah vii. by which he is declared subject to total ignorance, the Rev. Editor attributes (p. 534) such ignorance to the human nature of Jesus, forgetting what he, in common with other orthodox Christians, offers as an explanation of such passages as declare all power in heaven and earth to have been given to Jesus by the Father of the universe, which is, that all power was given him in his human capacity, while in his divine capacity he enjoys independent omnipotence. Is not the power of distinguishing good from evil included in all power *given* to Jesus, according to the Editor, in his *human* capacity? How, then, can the Editor be justified in maintaining the idea that, in his human nature, he, though possessed of all power in heaven and earth, was unable, before the age of maturity, to distinguish the good from the evil, as found in verses 15 and 16? I beg also the attention of the Editor to Luke ii. 46—50, shewing that Jesus was possessed of knowledge of his di-

Digitized by Google

vine commission even in his early youth, and also to the Editor's own declaration, (page 536,) "The spirit of the Lord was to rest upon him, as the spirit of wisdom and understanding." Nothing but early prejudice can persuade a man to believe that *one* being at *one time* should be both subject to total ignorance and possessed of omniscience—two diametrically opposite qualities.

Let us now refer to the context of the verse in question. The first verse of the same chapter speaks of the king of Syria and the king of Israel having besieged Jerusalem; verses 3 and 4, of the Lord's having sent Isaiah, the prophet, to Ahaz, the king of Jerusalem, to offer him consolation and confidence against the attacks of these two kings; verses 5 and 6, of the two kings having taken evil counsel against Ahaz, and of their determination to set the son of Tabeal on his throne; verses 8 and 9 foretell the total fall of Ephraim (the ten tribes of Israelites who separated from Judah, which comprised the two remaining tribes) and of Samaria within three score and five years; verses 10 and 11 mention the Lord's offering to Ahaz a sign, which he (verses 12 and 13) declined; verses 14—16 contain the Lord's promise to give spontaneously a sign of the destruction of Ahaz's enemies in the person of the son borne by the virgin of Jerusalem; the delivery of Judah from these two kings before the child should become of age; verse 17, and following verses, foretell what was to happen in Judah, bringing the king of Assyria in opposition to the kings of Syria and of Israel, who were then inimical to the house of David. The first four verses

Digitized by Google

of chap. viii. speak of the birth of a son to Isaiah, the prophet, and of the depredations by the Assyrians on the land of Damascus, the capital of Syria, and on the land of Samaria, the head of Ephraim, before that son should have knowledge to cry, "My father and my mother." Hence it is evident that the child mentioned in ch. vii. verse 14, called Immanuel, was much older than the child mentioned ch. viii. 3; for the attacks upon Syria and Israel by the Assyrians took place only before the former became of age to know right from wrong, but while the latter was still unable to pronounce a single word Verse 6 speaks of the army of Rezin, and of the son of Remaliah, the kings of Syria and Israel, having refused the soft waters of Shiloah,* a river in Judah, figuratively meaning peace; verses 7 and 8, of the Lord's declaring that he would bring into the land of Immanuel, upon these invaders, the strong waters of the river, that is, the armies of the king of Assyria; verses 9 and 10, of the combination of the people against the king of Judah, which turned to their own destruction, for the sake of Immanuel. It is worth noticing, that the last word in verse 10, is translated in the English version, "God is with us," instead of leaving it, as it is in the original Hebrew, "Immanuel," though in two other instances (ch. vii. 14, and ch. viii. 8) the word "Immanuel" is left unchanged as it stands in the original. Verses 11—17, pronounce the Lord's displeasure at the disobedience of the tribes of Israel, advising them to fear the

* Shiloh, found in Gen. xlix. 10, implying a redeemer, differs in signification, and also in spelling, from the word "Shiloah," herein mentioned as signifying rivers: in Genesis, שִׁילֹה; in Isaiah viii. 6, שִׁלֹּחַ.

Digitized by Google

Lord, and not fear the confederacy of the kings of Syria and Israel. Verse 18 declares the Lord's having given the prophet and the children for signs and for wonders in Israel; and the remaining verses of this chapter speak of false prophets, of the miserable situation of the Israelites—a fact which is fully related in the 2d book of Kings, xvi. 5: "Then Rezin, king of Syria, and Pekah, son of Remaliah, king of Israel, came up to Jerusalem to war; and they besieged Ahaz, but could not overcome him." Ver. 6: "At that time, Rezin, king of Syria, recovered Elath to Syria, and drove the Jews from Elath; and the Syrians came to Elath, and dwelt there unto this day." Ver. 7: "So Ahaz sent messengers to Tilgath-Pileser, king of Assyria, saying, I am thy servant and thy son. Come up and save me out of the hand of the king of Syria, and out of the hand of the king of Israel, which rise up against me." Ver. 8: "And Ahaz took the silver and gold that was found in the house of the Lord, and in the treasures of the king's house, and sent it for a present to the king of Assyria." Ver. 9: "And the king of Assyria hearkened unto him: for the king of Assyria went up against Damascus, and took it, and carried the people of it captive to Kir, and slew Rezin."

It is now left to the public to reflect seriously on the above circumstances stated in the context, and to pronounce whether thereby it appears that verse 14 is originally applied to Hezekiah, the son and heir of Ahaz, king of Jerusalem, a child born before the defeat of his enemies, the Immanuel, whose land was Judah; or to Jesus of Nazareth, born at least 500

Digitized by Google

years afterwards: and also to decide whether or not the land which Ahaz abhorred, had been forsaken by the king of Syria and of Israel, from the interference of the king of Assyria, before Hezekiah came to years of discretion; or whether that event took place only after the birth of Jesus. As to the application of verse 4 to Jesus Christ, by St. Matthew, my language in the Second Appeal was, that "the evangelist Matthew referred in his Gospel to ch. vii. 14 of Isaiah, merely for the purpose of accommodation; the son of Ahaz and the Saviour resembling each other, in each being the means, at different periods, though in different senses, of establishing the throne of the house of David. In the same manner, the apostles referred to Hosea xi. 1, in ch. ii. 15 of his Gospel, and in many other instances." Nevertheless, the Rev. Editor charges me with having blasphemed against the word of God, by attempting to persuade him and others, in my explanation of the above verse, "that the evangelist Matthew ought not to be credited." I, indeed, never expected such an accusation from the Editor. To acquit myself of the charge, I entreat my readers to refer to the translation of the four Gospels by Dr. Campbell, a celebrated Trinitarian writer, in whose notes (page 9) that learned divine says, "Thus ch. ii. 15, a declaration from the prophet Hosea xi. 1, which God made in relation to the people of Israel, whom he had long before called from Egypt, is applied by the historian *allusively* to Jesus Christ, where all that is meant is, that with equal truth, or rather, with much greater energy of signification, God might

Digitized by Google

now say, *I have recalled my son out of Egypt.* Indeed, the import of the Greek phrase, as commonly used by the sacred writers, is no more, as Le Clerc has justly observed, than that such words of any of the prophets may be applied with truth to such an event."

Did these orthodox writers also attempt to persuade people to discredit the evangelical writings by applying Hosea xi. 1, originally to Israel, and allusively to Jesus Christ? The Editor will not, I presume, get the sanction of the public to accuse those learned divines of blasphemy. I did no more than adopt their mode of expression in examining Isaiah vii. 14, compared with Matt. i. 22, 23, and Hosea xi. 1, with Matt. ii. 15; yet I am charged with blasphemy against the authority of the Gospel of Matthew. I must repeat the very words I used in the Second Appeal, in comparing the book of Hosea with the Gospel of Matthew (pp. 263, 264,) that the public may judge whether the language of the Editor, as to my attempt to discredit the Gospel, is just and liberal. "Thus Matt. ii. 15, 'Out of Egypt have I called my son,' the evangelist refers to Hosea xi. 1, which, though really applied to Israel, represented there as the son of God, is used by the apostle in reference to the Saviour, in consideration of a near resemblance between their circumstances in this instance:—both Israel and Jesus were carried into Egypt and recalled from thence, and both were denominated in the Scriptures the 'Son of God.' The passage of Hosea thus runs from chap. xi. 1—3: 'When Israel was a child, then I

Digitized by Google

loved him, and called my son out of Egypt. As they called them, so they went from them: they sacrificed unto Baalim, and burnt incense to graven images. I taught Ephraim also to go, taking them by their arms; but they know not that I healed them;'—in which Israel, who is represented as a child of God, is declared to have sacrificed to Baalim, and to have burnt incense to graven images—circumstances which cannot justly be ascribed to the Saviour."

The Rev. Editor, likewise in opposition to my explanation, applies Isaiah ix. 6 to Jesus: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace;" and all that he says (page 534) in support of his referring this verse to the deity of Jesus, is in these words:—"To secure to Hezekiah that passage in ch. ix. our author gives us a translation, or rather a paraphrase of it by Jonathan, in his Targum, to which we shall merely oppose that given by Bishop Lowth." Can the interpretation of the Old Testament given by Jonathan and other celebrated Jewish writers, some of whom lived prior to the birth of Jesus, be discredited from the authority of one, or one thousand, Christian bishops, to whom, at any rate, Hebrew is a foreign language? Can a Trinitarian, in arguing with one not belonging to the orthodox sect and establishment, quote with propriety, for the refutation of his adversary, the authority of a Trinitarian writer? The public may be the best judges of these points. As these Jewish writ-

ings are not unprocurable, the public may refer to them for their own satisfaction. Is there any authority of the sacred writers of the New Testament authorizing the Editor to apply Isaiah ix. 6, even in an accommodated sense, to Jesus? I believe nothing of the kind:—it is mere enthusiasm that has led a great many learned Trinitarians to apply this verse to Jesus. The Editor avoided noticing the context, and the historical circumstances which I adduced in my Appeal to prove the application of the verse in question to Hezekiah. It may be of use, however, to call his attention again to the subject. I therefore beg of him to observe those facts, and particularly the following instances. Ch. ix. 1, promises that Israel shall not suffer so severely from the second as from the former invasion of the king of Assyria, when he invaded Lebanon and Naphtali and Galilee beyond Jordan. So we find it mentioned in 2 Kings xv. 29: "In the days of Pekah, king of Israel, Tiglath-Pileser, king of Assyria, took Ijon and Abel-Beth-Maachah, and Janoah, and Kedesh, and Hazor, and Gilead, and Galilee, and all the land of Naphtali, and carried Israel captive to Assyria." But in the reign of Hezekiah, so far from reducing Israel to captivity, the king of Assyria was compelled to return to his country with great loss, leaving Israel safe in their places. (2 Kings xix. 35, 36.) Verses 2 and 3 declare the joy which Israel were to feel at their delivery from the hands of their cruel invaders, and (ver. 4) at throwing off the yoke and rod of the oppressor. We find accordingly, in 2 Kings xviii. 7, that Hezekiah rebelled against the

Digitized by Google

king of Assyria, and served him not. Verse 5 foretells the destruction of the army of the invaders. So we find, 2 Kings xix. 34, 35, that the angel of the Lord slew a great part of the army of the Assyrian invaders. Verses 6 and 7 speak of the illustrious son who was then to reign with justice and judgment. So we find in 2 Kings xviii. 3—7, that Hezekiah during his reign did what was right in the sight of God, so that, after or before him, there was none like him among the kings of Judah; and that the Lord was with him wheresoever he went.—Verses 9 and 10 speak of the displeasure of the Lord at the pride and stoutness of heart of Ephraim and the inhabitants of Samaria, the enemies of Hezekiah and his father. So we find in 2 Kings xviii. 10, 11, that the people of Samaria were defeated and made prisoners by the Assyrians in the sixth year of Hezekiah. Verse 11, of the Lord's setting up the adversaries of Rezin, the king of Syria, against him. So we find in Isaiah vii. that Rezin, the king of Syria, who, with Ephraim, besieged Jerusalem at the time the city had borne the child mentioned in ch. vii. 14, was defeated by his adversaries. Verses 12—20 describe the anger of God, as occasioned by the wickedness of Israel.—Verse 21, of Ephraim and Manasseh having joined together to invade Judah. Ch. x. 1—6, denounce punishment to the wicked people of Judah by the hands of the Assyrians. So we find in 2 Kings xviii. 13, that in the fourteenth year of king Hezekiah, the great king of Assyria came against Judah, and took all her fenced cities. Verses 8—

Digitized by Google

14, of the boasting of the king of Assyria as to his power and conquests of many kingdoms, and his destruction of the gods of different nations, and of his contempt for the living God of the Jews in Jerusalem. So we find in 2 Kings xviii. 33—35, and xix. 11—14, that the king of Assyria boasted of his great power, and of having subdued the gods of the nations, and that he despised Jehovah, the true, living God, even blaspheming him in a message to Hezekiah. Verses 12—26, promising to punish the king of Assyria, and to bring ruin upon him, for his high boastings, and for his contempt against the Lord. So we find in 2 Kings xix. 21—34, that the Lord encouraged *the* virgin, the daughter of Zion, and the daughter of Jerusalem, to despise the king of Assyria, whom he had determined to punish for his disrespect; and promised safety to the inhabitants of Jerusalem on the prayer offered by Hezekiah. So also we find in 2 Kings xix. 35, and 2 Chron. xxxii. 21, that the Lord sent his angel into the camp of the king of Assyria and slew his mighty men, leaders and captains. Verse 27 promises the king of Judah's liberation from the yoke of the king of Assyria. So we find, 2 Kings xviii. 7, that Hezekiah rebelled against the king of Assyria, and served him not afterwards. It was not Hezekiah alone that, in the beginning of his reign, acknowledged dependence upon the king of Assyria, but his father Ahaz also confessed the superiority of the king of Assyria, and sued to him for protection against the kings of Syria and of Israel when Hezekiah was only a child, (2 Kings xvi. 7, 8.)

Digitized by Google

The public may now judge whether or not the above circumstances, and the contents of chapters vii. and viii. noticed in the preceding paragraphs, determine the application of Isaiah ix. 6, 7, to Hezekiah, who "did that which was right in the sight of the Lord;" "removed high places;" "broke the images and cut down the groves;" "trusted in the Lord God of Israel;" "clave to the Lord, and departed not from following him;" "with whom the Lord *was;*" who "prospered whithersoever he went;" and prior and subsequent to whose reign, "was none like him among all the kings of Judah." (2 Kings xviii. 3—7.) And they may also decide whether the delivery of Israel from the attack of the Assyrians, and the punishment inflicted upon the king of Assyria in the prescribed manner, took place in the reign of Hezekiah, or that of Jesus Christ. If my readers compare minutely chapters vii.—x. and xxxix. of Isaiah with 2 Kings xv. xvi. xviii.—xx. they will, I trust, have a still clearer view of the subject.

In common with the son mentioned in Isaiah ix. 6, who was called Hezekiah, "*God my strength,*" "*Immanuel,*" "*God with* us," Wonderful, Counsellor, mighty God, the Father of the everlasting age, the Prince of Peace," human beings, and even inanimate objects, were designated by the same terms, or similar epithets, as noticed in pages 283—285, 315, 316, of my Second Appeal, without being held up as the most high Jehovah.

Moreover, the difference between "to be" and "to be called" is worth observing, as I noticed in

Digitized by Google

the note at pp. 315, 316, of the Second Appeal, to which I beg to refer my readers. As to the phrases "no end," and "forever," or "everlasting," found in Isaiah ix. 6, 7, these when applied to creatures are always to be taken in a limited sense, the former signifying plenteousness, the latter long duration, as I observed in note, page 277 of the Second Appeal Vide Gen. xlix. 26; Heb. iii. 6.

St. Matthew, in an accommodated sense, applies Isaiah ix. 1, 2, to Jesus, whose spiritual reign delivered also the inhabitants of Zebulun, and the land of Naphtalim and Galilee, from the darkness of sin, in the same way as in Hezekiah's reign their inhabitants were saved from the darkness of foreign invasion.

As the Editor and many orthodox Christians lay much stress on the application of the term Immanuel to Jesus, I offer the following observations. The sum total of their argument is derived from the following verse, Matt. i. 23: "And they shall call his name Immanuel, which, being interpreted, is God with us." This name is composed of three Hebrew words, "Emma" עם with; "noo," נו us; "el," אל God; that is, with us God; hence the advocates for the Trinity conclude that Jesus is here called God, and that he must therefore be God. But let us ascertain whether other beings are not, in common with Jesus, called by designations compounded with *el*, or God, in the sacred writings, or whether the term *el* is exclusively applied to Jehovah and Jesus, and then direct our attention to the above-stated conclusion. Gen. xxxii. 24: "And Jacob was left

Digitized by Google

alone, and there wrestled a man with him until the breaking of the day." Ver. 30: "And he (Jacob) called the name of the place פניאל, Peni*el*; for I have seen *God* face to face, and my life is preserved." Here the place is called the face of *el*, (God,) and the angel who wrestled with and blessed Jacob, and whom he saw there, is styled *el* (God.) Ver. 28: "And he (the angel) said, Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Isra*el*; for as a prince hast thou power with God and with men, and hast *prevailed*." As Jacob in wrestling with the angel, shewed him his power and prevailed, he was called *Israel*, the prince of God, or, properly speaking, the prince of the angel; for it would be the grossest blasphemy to say that Jacob wrestled with the Almighty God, and prevailed over him. So we find in Gen. xlvi. 17, "Malchi*el*," that is, "my king God;" Dan. viii. 16, "Gabri*el*," "mighty God;" 1 Chron. xv. 18, "Jaazi*el*," "strong God;" ver. 20, Jehi*el*, "living God;" 1 Sam. viii. 2, "The name of his first-born was Jo*el*," that is, "Jehovah God."

Moreover, the very term Immanuel is applied immediately in Isaiah vii. 14, to the deliverer of Judah from the invasion of the king of Syria, and that of Israel, during the reign of Ahaz; but none esteemed him to be God, from the application of this term to him. Besides, by referring to Parkhurst's Hebrew Lexicon, on the explanation of the word *el*, (or God,) we find "that Christian emperors of the fourth and fifth centuries would suffer themselves to be addressed by the style of "*your divinity*," "*your Godship*." And also by referring to the Old Testa-

Digitized by Google

ment we find the terms* אל el, אלהים elohim, or God, often applied to superiors. No one, therefore, can be justified in charging the apostle Matthew with inconsistency, on account of his having used, even in an accommodated sense, the phrase "Immanuel," for Jesus, appointed by God as the Lord of the Jews and Gentiles.

The Editor denies the truth of my assertion in the Second Appeal, (page 283,) that David is also called the holy one of Israel, in Psalm lxxxix. and insists that Jehovah and the future Messiah only are styled the holy one. I therefore beg to refer my readers to the whole context of the Psalm in question, a few passages of which I here subjoin. Ver. 19, 20: "Then thou spakest in vision to *thy holy one*, and saidst, I have found *David*, my *servant*; with my *holy oil* have I *anointed* him." Vers. 26, 27: "He shall *cry* unto me, thou art my Father, *MY GOD*, and the Rock of *MY SALVATION*. Also I *will* make him my first-born." Ver. 35: "Once have I sworn by my holiness, that I will not lie unto *DAVID*." Vers. 38, 39: "But thou hast cast off and *abhorred*, thou hast been *wroth* with *thine anointed*. Thou hast made *void* the covenant of thy servant." Ver. 44: "Thou hast made his glory to cease." Ver. 45: "Thou hast covered him with shame." The public now may judge whether the above sentences are applicable to king David, or to Jesus, whose *glory* never *ceased*, with whom God has

* Ezekiel xxxi. 11: אל גוים "The mighty one of the heathen." Exod. xv. 15: אלי מואב "The mighty men of Moab." 1 Sam. xxviii. 13: ראיתי אלהים "I saw God," that is, Samuel. Exodus xxii. 8: אל האלהים "To the Gods;" that is, the judges.

Digitized by Google

never been *wroth*, and who cannot be supposed to have been covered with *shame*. Besides, it is evident from this passage, that the term "holy one" is applied to one constantly styled a servant.

The Editor inquires, (page 570,) what instances I bring that these names, peculiar to God, such as wonderful, counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace, were applied to certain kings in Israel; I therefore beg to refer him to the passages mentioned in pages 315 and 316 of the Second Appeal, in which he will find the same epithets given to human beings, and even to inanimate objects.

With a view to deduce the deity of Jesus Christ from the comparison of Isaiah xxviii. 16, with Isaiah viii. 13, and with 1 Peter ii. 8, the Rev. Editor thus comments (page 570): "The declaration is, that Jehovah of hosts shall be for a stumbling-stone, and for a rock of offence to the two houses of Israel: but after the delivery of this prophecy, was he this to them prior to the coming of Christ? As the house of Israel was carried away captive a few years after the delivery of this prophecy, if not a year or two before, it is doubtful whether they ever saw this prophecy while in their own land; but Christ has been a stone of stumbling and rock of offence to all of every tribe for nearly eighteen centuries, while he has been a sanctuary to all who have trusted in him." I need not prolong the discussion by pointing out, that Isaiah delivered this prophecy in the reign of Ahaz, that the captivity of one of the houses of Israel took place in the reign of Hezekiah, his son, and

Digitized by Google

that of the other house, in the reign of Zedekiah, the ninth king of Judah, from the time of Ahaz. As the Editor acknowledges the fact of the house of Israel being "carried away captive a few years after the delivery of this prophecy," he will undoubtedly be persuaded to confess, also, the circumstance of their distress and misery just before, as well as during the time of captivity, by an attentive reference to the sacred histories, 2 Kings and 2 Chron. The necessary consequence, then, will be, that he will clearly perceive that the above-stated prophecy of Isaiah had been duly fulfilled long before Christ's birth, the Lord of hosts having become for a stumbling-stone and for a rock of offence to the two houses of Israel, soon after the prophet's declaration; and that 1 Peter ii. 7, 8, ("The stone which the builders disallowed, the same *is made* the head of the corner. And a stone of stumbling, and rock of offence, even to them who stumble at the word, being disobedient,") is but a general statement of the ill consequences attached to disobedience, whether on the part of Israel, or of the Gentiles, to the *word* delivered to them by Jesus in his divine commission. Jesus is here represented as a stone, rejected by men but chosen by God; and, consequently, he must be a stumbling-stone to those who reject him, stumbling at his word. Common sense, if not biassed by early prejudice, is sufficient to decide, that a stone, which is chosen and made the head of the corner by a maker, must not be esteemed as the maker himself.

The Editor comments, however, on the phrase,

Digitized by Google

"made the head of the corner," in verse 7, saying, "As to his being made the head of the corner by his heavenly Father, this can no more affect his unchangeable deity, than his being made flesh." This is as much as to say, that the circumstance of his being made the head of the corner is as *much* a proof of his changeable nature as the fact of his being made flesh; for were we to admit, that the circumstance of an object being made flesh, or matter, which he was not before, does not evince the changeableness of the nature of that object, we must then be at a loss to discover even a single changeable object in the world. If one's being made flesh, and his growth and reduction, in the progress of time, should not be considered as an evidence of a change in him, every man might claim the honor of an immutable nature, and set up as God made flesh.

The Editor says, (page 571,) that I "attempted to evade Isaiah xl. 3, ('The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God,') by coupling it with Malachi iii. 1, ('Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me; and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come into his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in; behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts,') and confining his animadversions to the latter." I trust the Editor, by referring to Mark i. 2, 3, will find, that in coupling the above verses, I did no more than follow the example of that evangelist, who also coupled them in his Gospel. As the explanation, adopted by me, of

Digitized by Google

the prophecy of Malachi, fully explains the passage of Isaiah, I confined my animadversion to the former; for, "we find, in the book of that prophet, distinct and separate mention of Jehovah, and of the Messiah, as the messenger of the covenant: John, therefore, ought to be considered as the forerunner of both, *and as the preparer of the way of both;* in the same manner as a commander, sent in advance to occupy a strong post in the country of the enemy, may be said to be *preparing the way* for the battles of his king, or of the general, whom the king places at the head of his army." (Second Appeal, pp. 285, 286.) On which explanation the Editor observes, that "The fact is, that Malachi does not mention two; it is Jehovah who was suddenly to come into his temple; and afterwards, Jehovah and the messenger of the covenant are identified by the prophets," adding, "he shall come," not "they." But we find, in the original Hebrew, Mal. iii. 1, "*and* the messenger of the covenant," with the conjunction "and," after the mention of the Lord. It is, therefore, evident, that the messenger of the covenant is *distinctly* and separately mentioned. How the Editor supposes that "Malachi does not mention two," I am unable to guess. We find also, immediately after the mention of "the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in," the prophet adds, "Behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts," as the saying of Jehovah.—How can the mention of the messenger of the covenant, in the third person, by the Deity, prove the unity of that messenger with the Deity? Were we to admit, that every being

Digitized by Google

spoken of in the third person by God, is identified with God, the number of identified gods must, in that case, amount at least to thousands in the sacred writings. It is worth observing, that in the original Hebrew, "the messenger of the covenant" stands as nominative to the verb בא or "shall come," with the pronoun "he." The verse thus stands in the original: "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me; and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple; *and* the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in; behold, he shall come, (or, IS COMING,) saith the Lord of hosts." The Editor adds, "That Jesus is Jehovah, mentioned in Isaiah xl. 3, whose way John was sent to prepare, is confirmed by the testimony of Zechariah, and John his son." As to the nature of Jesus, Zechariah gives us to understand, (Luke i. 69,) that God "hath raised up an *horn* of salvation for us in the house of his servant David." In the evangelical writings of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, we find Jesus represented by John, as mightier than himself. In John we find still more explicit testimony, (i. 29,) "Behold the *Lamb* of God, who taketh away the sin of the world." (30.) "This is he of whom I said, After me cometh *a man* who is preferred before me." My readers may now judge whether Zechariah and John confirmed the identity of Jesus with Jehovah, or represented him as a creature *raised* and exalted by his and our Father, the Most High.

Some orthodox divines having attempted to prove the deity of Jesus, by comparing Isaiah xl. 10, ("Be-

Digitized by Google

hold, the Lord God will come with a strong hand, and his arm shall rule for him: behold, his reward is with him, and his work before him,") with Rev. xxii. 12, ("Behold, I come quickly, and my reward is with me, to give to every man according as his work shall be,") I brought to their notice, (in my Second Appeal, page 296,) John v. 30, 22, "The Father judgeth no man, but *hath committed* all judgment *unto the Son;*" and Matt. xvi. 27, "For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and then he shall reward every man according to his works." To weaken the force of my argument, the Editor says, (p. 573,) "These passages, however, do not in the least affect the question, which is not, by what authority Christ rewards, but whether he be the person described as rewarding; and this, these very passages confirm, particularly Rev. xxii. 12." If in the adminstering of judgment and of reward, as well as in the performance of miracles, the authority by which these things are done should be considered as a matter of no consequence, the almighty power of Jesus, and that of several others, might be established on an equal footing. Is it not, therefore, a subject worthy of question, whether Joshua ordered the sun and the moon to stop their motions, by the authority of God, or by his own power? Is it not a question worth determining, whether Elijah raised the dead by the authority of the Most High, or independently of the Almighty power? But if we consider it incumbent on us to believe and to know that those prophets performed works peculiarly ascribed to God, by the

Digitized by Google

authority of his Divine Majesty; why should we not deem it also necessary to ascertain whether the authority to judge men, and reward them accordingly, as well as the power of performing miracles, were vested in Jesus, by the omnipotent God, or exercised by him independently of the Father of the universe? In point of fact, we find the following positive avowal of Jesus himself—"The Father judgeth no man, but hath *committed* all judgment unto the Son."—"As I hear I judge; and my judgment is just: because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father who hath sent me." Here the Editor offers the following explanation, saying, that "All power, as to providence and final judgment, is *committed* to him, not merely as the Son, but as the Son of Man, the Mediator, because he made himself the Son of Man." This amounts to the doctrine of the two-fold nature of Jesus, the absurdity of which I have often noticed. I may, however, be permitted to ask the Editor, whether there is any authority for the assertion that Jesus, as the Son of Man, was dependent on God for the exercise of his power; but as the Son of God was quite an independent Deity? So far from meeting with such authority, we find that Jesus, in every epithet that he was designated by, is described to be subject to and dependent on God. Acts xvii. 31: "Because he hath appointed a day in which HE will judge the world in righteousness, *by* that *MAN whom he hath ordained*; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that HE *hath raised him* from the dead." John viii. 28: "Then said Jesus unto them, When ye have lifted up the

Digitized by Google

hold, the Lord God will come
and his arm shall rule for him
is with him, and his work bef
xxii. 12. ("Behold, I come quick
is with me, to give to every m
work shall be.") I brought in
Second Appeal, page 296,) Jo
Father judgeth no man, but hath
ment unto the Son;" and Matt. x
of Man shall come in the glory of
angels, and then he shall reward
ing to his works." To weaken th
quence, the Editor says, (p. 573,)
es, however, do not in the least a
which is not, by what authority C
whether he be the person describ
and this, these very passages co
Rev. xxii. 12." It is the administ
and of reward, as well as in the pe
racles, the authority by which these
should be considered as a matter of
the almighty power of Jesus, and
others, might be established on an e
it not, therefore, a subject worth
whether Joshua ordered the sun a
stop their motions, by the authority
his own power? Is it not a questio
moment, whether Elijah raised the d
thority of the Most High, or independ
almighty power? But if we consider
us to believe and to know that th
performed works peculiarly ascribed to

Digitized by Google

authority of his Divine Majesty [illegible]
not deem it also necessary [illegible]
authority to judge men, and reward [illegible]
ly, as well as the power of perform[illegible]
vested in Jesus, by the omnipotent God, [illegible]
ed by him independently of the Father [illegible]
verse? In point of fact, we find the [illegible]
tive avowal of Jesus himself—"The Father [illegible]
no man, but hath *committed* all judgment [illegible]
Son."—"As I hear I judge: and my judgment [illegible]
just: because I seek not mine own will, but the will
of the Father who hath sent me." Here the Edi-
tor offers the following explanation, saying, that "All
power, as to providence and final judgment, is com-
mitted to him, not merely as the Son, but as the Son
of Man, the *Mediator*, because he made himself the
Son of Man." This amounts to the doctrine of the
two-fold nature of Jesus, the absurdity of which I
have often noticed. I may, however, be permitted
to ask the Editor, whether there is any authority for
the assertion that Jesus, as the Son of Man, was de-
pendent on God for the exercise of his power, but
as the Son of God was quite an independent Deity?
So far from meeting with such authority, we find
that Jesus, in every epithet that he [illegible]
is described to be subject [illegible]
Acts xvii. 31: "Because he hath appointed [illegible]
which he will judge the world [illegible]
that *MAN* whom he hath ordained [illegible]
hath given assurance unto all men [illegible]
raised him from the dead." [illegible]
said Jesus [illegible]

Digitized by Google

SON of MAN, then shall ye know that I am he, and that *I do nothing of myself;* but as my Father hath *taught me*, I speak these things." xvii. 1, 2: "Father, the hour is come: glorify thy Son, that THY SON also may glorify thee. As *thou hast given HIM* power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as *thou hast given him.*" Hebrews i. 8, 9: "Thy throne, O *GOD*, is forever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom: Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore God, even THY GOD, hath *anointed thee* with the oil of gladness above *thy fellows.*" The Editor says, "His glory he (the Son) may, for a season, lay aside, but his divine nature he can never change." I wish to be informed what kind of divine nature it was that could be divested of its glory* and power,† even for a season. To my understanding, such divinity must be analogous to matter without space or gravity, or sunbeam without light, which my limited capacity, I must confess, cannot comprehend.

The Editor finally argues, that "as the Father's commiting to the Son the entire work and glory of being the final judge of all, judging no man himself, does not change his glorious nature, so the Son's laying aside his glory and becoming man, in no way changes his original nature and godhead." It is true that God's committing to the Son the authority of judgment, bestowing on the sun the power of casting light upon the planets round him, and enabling superiors to provide food and protection for their

* John xvii. 5, 22. † John xvii. 2; Acts x. 38.

Digitized by Google

dependents, do not imply any change in his glorious nature; for it is ordained by the laws of nature, that nothing can be effected, in this visible world, without the intervention of some physical means; but that the Son's, or any other being's, *laying aside* his glory and becoming a man, must produce at least a temporary change in his nature, is a proposition as obvious as any that can be submitted to the understanding.

I have, of course, omitted to quote John v. 23, during this discussion in my Second Appeal, because it has no relation to the subject, and because I noticed it fully in another part of that publication, page 189.

I will also refrain from noticing, in this place, Heb. i. 12, alluded to by the Editor, as I have already considered that passage as fully as possible in the preceding chapter, pp. 101, 102.

The Editor next comes to Isaiah xliv. 6: "Thus saith the Lord, the King of Israel, and his redeemer Jehovah of hosts, I am the first and I am the last, and beside me there is no God;" comparing it with Rev. i. 8, and xxii. 13. This argument has been already replied to in my Second Appeal; it shall be again adverted to shortly. He then endeavors to prove that Jesus cannot be meant as prohibiting John from worshipping him in verse 9, saying, that "In this book five persons address at different times; two of the elders around the throne, two angels, and he who is the grand speaker throughout the book—whom he, after the first chapter, often introduces without the least notice, while he previously describes every other speaker with the utmost care." The

Digitized by Google

Editor, however, has quoted only instances in which John describes the two elders and the two angels in a distinct manner; but I cannot find that he adduces even a single instance where the "grand speaker" is "introduced without the least notice." Again, he says, "How could Jesus forbid John to worship him, after he received worship by the command of God from all the angels ?" I may be, on the same principle, justified in asking the Editor, How the angel could forbid John to worship him, while he knew that other angels of God, and even human beings, had received worship from fellow-creatures? Joshua v. 14: "And Joshua fell on his face to the earth, and did worship, and said unto him," (the captain of the host of the Lord,) "What saith my Lord unto his servant?" Numb. xxii. 31: "And he (Balaam) saw the angel of the Lord standing in the way, and his sword drawn in his hand, and he bowed down his head, and fell flat on his face." Daniel ii. 46: "Then the king Nebuchadnezzar fell upon his face and worshipped Daniel." As the Editor's argument, therefore, must apply with equal force to angels as to Jesus, it is quite plain that no conclusion can be drawn from it relative to the identity of the being who, in Rev. xxii. 9, forbids John to worship *him*. The fact is, that the word "worship," in scriptural language, is used sometimes as implying an external mark of religious reverence paid to God; and since, in this sense, worship was offered by John to the angel, or to Jesus, he refused it, as is evident from the last sentence of verse 9, "worship God;"—and sometimes the same word "worship" is used as signifying

Digitized by Google

merely a token of civil respect due to superiors: and accordingly, in this latter sense, not only Jesus, but angels and prophets, and even temporal princes or masters, used to accept of it, as we find in Matt. xviii. 26, "The servant, therefore, fell down and worshipped him," and so in various other instances. It denotes, in this acceptation, merely a mark of reverence, which neither identifies those to whom it is offered with the Deity, nor raises them to a level with their Creator, the Most High. My readers will observe, that the author of the book of Revelation declares himself, in ch. i. 17, to have fallen at the feet of Jesus; and he speaks also, in ch. v. 8, of the four beasts and four-and-twenty elders having fallen down before the Lamb; avoiding, however, in these places, as well as throughout the whole book of Revelation, the use of the word worship to express the reverence shewn to the Lamb; while to the words "fell down," when referring to God, he adds invariably, "and worshipped him." Vide ch. vii. 11, xi. 16, xix. 4, and v. 14. 3dly. He says, "How could Jesus, who declares himself to be Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, reject worship from John?" I do not wonder at the Editor's entirely neglecting to notice my remarks on the terms "Alpha and Omega," or, "the beginning and the end," in the Second Appeal, page 295,—to wit, "Alpha and Omega, beginning and end, are, in a finite sense, justly applicable to Jesus,"—when I find him regardless of the explanation given by John himself respecting these terms, and by St. Paul, one of his fellow-laborers. Rev. iii.

Digitized by Google

14: "These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, *the beginning of the creation of God:* I know thy works," &c. Col. i. 15: "The first-born of every creature." i. Cor. xv. 24: "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom *to God, even the Father.*" Ver. 28: "And when *all things* shall be subdued unto him, *then* shall the Son *also* himself be subject unto him, that God may be all in all."

As to Rev. i. 8, introduced again by the Editor, the expressions it contains are given as those of God himself, and not of Christ, since it describes the speaker to be Him "who is, and who was, and who is to come, the Almighty"—an epithet peculiarly applied to God five times in the book of Revelation, and very often throughout the rest of the sacred writings, and which is but a repetition of what is found in the preceding verse (4) of that chapter. Being equivalent to "Jehovah," it has never been applied to Jesus in any part of the Revelation, either separately or joined with the terms "Alpha and Omega." But, as I have already fully noticed this verse in page 123, I will not return to the subject here. 4thly. The Editor urges, "How could Jesus, who searches the heart, reject the acceptance of worship?" In answer to which, I beg to remind him, that the prophets and the apostles also, as far as they possessed the gift of prophecy, were able to discover what passed in the hearts of other men, or, in other words, were "searchers of hearts." Thus, in the Acts of the Apostles, ch. v. 3, 4, 8, 9, St. Peter is represented as a searcher of the heart; but he is

Digitized by Google

again stated, in ch. x. 25, 26, to have prohibited Cornelius from offering him worship. And in 2 Kings vi. 32, Elisha is declared to have known what passed in the heart of the king, without our therefore acknowledging him as an object of religious worship.

The Editor, lastly, lays stress on the phrase found in Rev. vii. 17, "The Lamb who is *in the midst* of the throne," overlooking the application of the same word "midst" to the elders and the four beasts, in ch. iv. 6. Besides, such a phrase as "to sit with the Father on his throne," implies nothing in the book of Revelation except an acquisition of holy perfection and honor, which Jesus, in common with every righteous Christian, acquired *through his merits.*— Ch. iii. 21: "To him that *overcometh* will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also *overcame*, and am set down with my Father in his throne."

In answer to his assertion, that it is "the Lamb whom the blessed constantly adore, crying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty," I beg to refer my readers to ch. iv. 8, which contains this phrase; nay, rather to the whole of the chapter, where they will find that no mention of "the Lamb," or Jesus, is once made.

The Editor observes, (page 577,) that "in verses 5, 6, of ch. xxi. another speaker besides the angel is introduced in an abrupt manner." I therefore repeat verse 11, of ch. xx. and verse 5—7 of ch. xxi. and leave my readers to judge whether or not the speaker is here introduced in the same ab-

Digitized by Google

rupt* manner as he is alleged to be in ch. xxii. 12, according to the interpretation of the Editor. Ch. xx. 11: "And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away, and there was found no place for them." Ch. xxi. 5: "And *he that* sat upon the throne *said*, Behold, I make all things new. And he said unto me, Write, for these words are true and faithful." Ver. 6: "And he said unto me, It is done. I am Alpha and Omega," &c. Ver. 7: "He that overcometh shall inherit all things, and I will be *his God*, and he shall be *my son*."

I really cannot perceive what the Editor could have meant by the following remark: "He there (in ver. 5) uses the same language found in ch. xxii. 6, 'Write, for these words are true and faithful'!" I hope he could not have intended to identify the speaker in ch. xxii. 6, who represents himself as a fellow-servant of John, with the speaker in ch. xxi. 5, who thus, speaking of himself, says, (ver. 7,) "I will be his God, and he shall be my son." Besides, the language found in ch. xxi. 5, is not "the very same" used in ch. xxii. 6, since in the former the whole speech stands thus—"*Write, for* these sayings are true and faithful;" but in the latter we find only, "These sayings are faithful and true;" but not the verb "*write*," nor the causal preposition "*for*."

The Editor comes next to what he calls internal evidence; saying, "Internal evidence, however, de-

* In the book of Revelation, John introduces, about eighty times, different speakers, but not once without a distinct notice of the speaker in the context. In ch. xvi. 14, 15, the day of the Lord is metaphorically introduced as a speaker. Vide 1 Thess. v. 3, and 2 Peter iii. 10.

Digitized by Google

monstrates that this angel neither said, 'Behold, I come quickly,' (ver. 7,) nor 'I am Alpha and Omega,' (ver. 13)." Let us now examine the context and the style of the writings of the book of Revelation. 1st. There is not a single instance in the whole book of Revelation, in which a speech is repeated without the previous introduction of the speaker; and in this instance we find an angel is previously introduced in ver. 6, as the speaker of ver. 7. The passage in question (vers. 6—13) runs thus: "And he said unto me, These sayings are faithful and true: and the Lord God of the holy prophet sent his angel to shew his servant the things which must shortly be done. Behold, I come quickly: blessed is he who keeps the prophecy of this book. I John saw these things, and heard them. And when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel who shewed me these things. Then saith he unto me, See thou do it not; for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book: worship God. And he saith unto me, Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book, for the time is at hand. He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still; he that is righteous, let him be righteous still; and he that is holy, let him be holy still. And behold, I come quickly, and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last." I am, therefore, quite at a loss to comprehend how the

Digitized by Google

Editor can justify himself in ascribing verses 6, 8, and 9, to one being, and verse 7th to another, in which there is no notice whatsoever of a new speaker. 2dly. There is only one agent in the whole train of these verses, extending as far as verse 20, and no unbiassed mind can, in the face of all the rules of composition, reject the relation of a verb to an appropriate nominative standing before it, in order to refer the same to a noun which is not found in any of the immediately preceding sentences. 3dly. Were we to follow the example of the Editor, and refer verses 6, 8, and 9, to an unknown angel, and verse 7 abruptly to Jesus, (which I conceive we cannot do, without defying common sense, and all the acknowledged laws of grammar,) we must be totally at a loss to account for the strange conduct of John towards Jesus, his Master, in falling down to worship before the feet of the angel, and neglecting Jesus entirely, though he saw and heard them both at one time, or rather his vision of Jesus was subsequent to that of the angel. 4thly. John himself explains whom he meant by the angel mentioned in xxii. 6, identifying this angel with Jesus, expressly named in the first chapter of Revelation. Ch. xxii. 6: "And the Lord God of the holy prophets sent his angel *to shew unto his servants the things which must shortly be done.*" Ch. i. 1: "God gave unto him, (Jesus,) *to shew unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass.*" As in the English version there is some difference, though of no consequence, in these two phrases, I therefore quote the original, containing the precise words in both instances, δειξαι τοις δουλοις αὐτου ἁ δει γενεσθαι εν ταχει.

Digitized by Google

I hope now that the explanation of the author of the book of Revelation, joined with the above-stated circumstances, will not fall short of producing conviction in the mind of the Editor and my other opponents.

We may easily find out the angel who is described in the latter end of ch. i. 1, as being sent by Jesus, by reference to ch. xxii. 16: "I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things *in the churches.*" We find here two things distinctly: one, that Jesus, designated as an angel in xxii. 6, *shewed*, as directed by God in ch. i. 1, *all things which must shortly come to pass;* and the other, that he sent his angel to shew to John and his other servants *these things in the churches*, respecting the Christian dispensation, as expressly mentioned in verse 1 of the book of Revelation, as well as in xxii. 16. 5thly. I will now have recourse to the rule recommended by the Editor, "that when the speaker is not expressly named, his language designates him." As the phrase "I come quickly," found elsewhere in the book of Revelation, is used expressly by Jesus as speaker in five different instances, (ii. 5, 16, iii. 11, xxii. 12, 20,) we must naturally ascribe this phrase in verse 7, to Jesus, and must, therefore, refer the immediately following verses (8, 9,) to him, in perfect consistency with all other scriptural writings. It is not only in verse 9 that Jesus calls himself a servant of God, and addresses Christians as brethren, but also in Matt. xii. 18, he represents himself as a chosen servant of the Most High; and in xxviii. 10, and John xx. 17, designates the disciples as his brethren.

Digitized by Google

If the Editor should say, according to the general mode of Trinitarian exposition, that the adoption of such designations was in reference to the human capacity of Jesus, he will perhaps give up the present difference from me, under the supposition that in this instance also Jesus calls himself a servant of God, and his followers brethren, as well as forbids John to worship him, merely in his human capacity.

I now conclude my reply to this branch of the Editor's argument, with a few remarks in allusion to such questions of the Editor, as "Is it that the Son of God, after receiving the worship of the highest archangel at God's express command, forbade John to worship him?" &c. I would ask, in turn, Can any man be justified in ascribing deity to one whose language is this: "As I received of *my Father*," (Rev. ii. 27); "I have not found thy works perfect before *God*," (iii. 2); "I will *confess* his name *before my Father*, and before his angels," (ver. 5); "Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of *my God*: I will write upon him the name of *my God*, and the name of the city of *my God*, which cometh down out of heaven from *my God*"? (Ver. 12.) Is it consistent with the nature of God to acquire exaltation through merit? Chap. v. 12: "Saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain *to receive* power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing." Ch. iii. 21: "To him that *overcometh* will I grant to sit with me in my throne, EVEN AS *I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne.*" Is it becoming of the nature of God to sing thus, addressing

Digitized by Google

himself to another being: "Great and marvellous are THY works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are THY WAYS, thou King of saints. Who shall not fear THEE, O Lord, and glorify THY name? for THOU ONLY art holy," &c.? ch. xv. 3, 4. Is not the Lamb throughout the whole Revelation mentioned separately and distinctly from God? Ch. i. 1: "The Revelation *of Jesus Christ*, which *God gave* unto him." Ver. 2: "Who bare record of the word *of God*, and of the testimony *of Jesus Christ*." Vers. 4, 5: "And peace *from him* who is, and who was, and who is to come; *and from* the seven spirits which are before his throne; *and from Jesus Christ*, who *is the faithful witness*." Ver. 9: "For the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ." Ch. v. 9: "Thou wast *slain*, and hast redeemed us to *God*." Ver. 10: "And hast made us unto *our God* kings and priests." Ch. xi. 15: "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of *our Lord*, and *of* HIS *Christ*." Ch. xii. 17: "Who keep the commandments *of God*, and have the testimony *of Jesus Christ*." Ch. xiv. 12: "That keep the commandments *of God*, and the faith *of Jesus*." Ch. xxi. 23: "For the glory *of God* did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof." John in ascribing to the Lamb most honorary epithets, those generally printed in capitals, takes great care in the choice of words. Ch. xix. 16: "He" (the Lamb) "hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, King of kings, and Lord of lords." Ch. xvii. 14: "For he (the Lamb) is Lord of lords and King of kings."—The apostle never once declares him to be "God of

Digitized by Google

Gods," the peculiar epithet of the Almighty Power. So the most holy saints sing first the song of Moses, and then that of the Lamb; having perhaps had in view the priority of the former to the latter in point of birth. Ch. xv. 3: "And they (the holy saints) sing the song of Moses, the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb."

In answer to one of the many insinuations made by the Editor in the course of his arguments, to wit, "If this be Christ, what must become of the precepts of Jesus?" (page 576,) I most reluctantly put the following query in reply: If a slain lamb be God Almighty, or his true emblem, what must be his worship, and what must become of his worshippers?

On the attempt to prove the deity of Jesus Christ by comparing Isaiah xlv. 23, ("Unto me," i. e. God, "every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear,") with Rom. xiv. 10—12, ("But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? For we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ. For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So, then, every one of us shall give account of himself to God,") I observed in my Second Appeal, (page 288,) that "between the prophet and the apostle there is a perfect agreement in substance, since both declare that it is to God that every knee shall bow and every tongue shall confess *through him* before whose judgment-seat we shall all stand: at the same time both Jesus and his apostles inform us, that we must stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, because

Digitized by Google

the Father has committed the office of final judgment to him." To which the answer of the Editor is this, "We here beg leave to ask our author, where the phrase *through him* is to be found? It must be in the author's copy of the prophet and the apostle—it is not in our's." By these words the Editor clearly means to insinuate, that the words in question are gratuitously inserted in my explanation, and without any authority in the holy scriptures. At least I am otherwise at a loss to understand what he means by saying, that the words of my paraphrase are not to be found in his edition of the Bible; for it would be unworthy to suppose of him that he wished to impress his readers with the idea, that I was quoting a particular passage falsely, instead of the fact that I was only giving my idea of its import. That I was fully warranted in my interpretation, I hope to convince the Editor himself, by referring him to the following passages, in which it is expressly declared that it is *through Jesus* that glory and thanks are to be given to God, and that we have peace with God; and also that it is BY Jesus Christ that God judgeth the world. Rom. xvi. 27: "To God only wise, be glory *through* Jesus Christ forever. Amen." Ch. v. 1. "We have peace with God *through* our Lord Jesus Christ." Ch. i. 8: "I thank my God *through* Jesus Christ." Ch. ii. 16: "In the day when God shall *judge* the secrets of men *by Jesus Christ.*" 2 Cor. v. 18: "All things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself *by Jesus Christ.*" John v. 22: "For the Father judgeth no man, but *hath committed* all judgment unto the Son." After con-

Digitized by Google

sidering these texts, no one can, I think, refuse to admit the correctness of my assertion, that it is *to God* every knee shall bow *through Christ*, before whose judgment-seat we shall stand, "because *the Father has committed* the office of final judgment *to him*," as being founded upon the best authority that man can appeal to.

Upon the interpretation of the above-mentioned passage of Isaiah, to wit, "It is Jesus that swears here by himself," I observed in my Second Appeal, "How can they escape the context, which expressly informs us that Jehovah God, and not Jesus, sware in this manner?" To this the Editor replies, that "the Son was Jehovah before he was Jesus," &c. Is not this merely a begging of the question, inasmuch as one may equally assert that Moses or Joshua was Jehovah before he was Moses or Joshua?

He further says, that "Jesus is so preeminently Saviour, that there is salvation in no other." I agree with the Editor so far as to declare Jesus to be, under God, the only Saviour mentioned in the records of the Christian dispensation; but previous to his birth there were many saviours raised by God to save his servants, as noticed already in page 56 and 63.

The Editor adds, that in [Isaiah xlv.] ver. 24, righteousness is used in such a sense as is principally applicable to the Son. I therefore transcribe the verse, that the reader may judge whether or not his position has any foundation: "Surely, shall one say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength: even to him shall men come; and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed."

Digitized by Google

Respecting the attempt to prove the deity of Jesus, from the circumstance of his being figuratively represented as the husband or the supporter of his church, John iii. 29, Eph. v. 23, and also God's being called the husband of his creatures, Isaiah liv. 5—I requested in my Second Appeal, (pp. 292, 293,) that "my readers would be pleased to examine the language employed in these two instances. In the one, God is represented as the husband of *all* his creatures, and in the other, Christ is declared to be the husband, or the head of his *followers:* there is, therefore, an inequality of authority evidently ascribed to God and to Jesus. Moreover, Christ himself shows the relation that existed between him and his church, and himself and God, in John xv. 1: 'I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman.' Ver. 5: 'I am the vine, ye are the branches,' &c. Would it not be highly unreasonable to set at defiance the distinction drawn by Jesus between God, himself, and his church?" The Editor has not taken the least notice of this last argument; he only glances over the former, saying, (page 579,) "Had our author examined the context with sufficient care, he would have found that those to whom God declares himself the husband, are so far from being all his creatures, that they are only one branch of his church, the Gentiles, the children of the desolate, in opposition to the Jews, the children of the married wife." I wonder how the choice of the designation "thy Maker," in Isaiah liv. 5, in preference to others, and its true force, could escape the notice of the Editor, as the phrase "thy Maker is thy husband"

Digitized by Google

implies in a general sense that whosoever is the maker is also the preserver, and, consequently, God is the husband, or the preserver, of all his creatures, including the Jews more especially as his chosen people. I, however, wish to know how the Editor justifies himself in concluding real unity between God and Jesus, from the application of the term husband to them, while Jesus declares the relation between God, himself, and his church, to be such as that existing between the husbandman, the vine, and its branches.

Some orthodox divines having attempted to establish the deity of Jesus, by comparing Jer. xxiii. 5, 6, ("I will raise unto David a righteous branch, and a king shall reign and prosper—and this is his name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS,") with 1 Cor. i. 30, ("Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness," &c.,) I replied, in my Second Appeal, (page 286,) that "I only refer my readers again to the passage in Jer. xxxiii. 16, in which Jerusalem also is called 'THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS,' and to the phrase, 'IS MADE *unto us of God*,' found in the passage in question, and expressing the inferiority of Jesus to God; and also to 2 Cor. v. 21, 'that we might be made the righteousness of God in him;' where St. Paul says, that all Christians may 'be made the righteousness of God;'" to which the Rev. Editor thus replies (page 580): "This does not at all affect the question in hand, which is simply, whether this righteous branch of David, this king, who shall reign and prosper, be Jesus Christ or not: and to prove

this, we need only call in the testimony of the angel to Mary, Luke i. 32, 33, 'The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever.'" The Editor here overlooks again the force of the phrase, "God shall *give* unto him (Jesus) the throne of his father David," implying, that the throne and exaltation which Jesus was possessed of, was but the *free gift* of God.

To lessen the force of such phrases as "being *made* of God," "God shall *give* unto him," &c. the Editor adds, that, "relative to his 'being made of God righteousness to us,' this can of course make no alteration in the Son's *eternal* nature." I therefore beg to ask the Editor, if one's being *made* by *another* any thing whatsoever that he was not before, does not tend to prove his mutable nature, what nature, then, can be called mutable in this transitory world? The Editor again advances, that Jesus "was Jehovah before he became incarnate," &c. This is a bare assertion which I must maintain to be without any ground, unless he means to advance the doctrine, that souls are emanations of God and proceed from the deity.

As to Jerusalem being called, "Jehovah our righteousness," the Editor says, "We may observe, that it is the church of Christ, the holy Jerusalem, who bears this name, to the honor of her glorious head and husband, who is, indeed, Jehovah her righteousness." (Page 581.) Let us reflect on this answer of the Editor. In the first place, the term Jerusalem, in Jer. xxxiii. 16, from its association with the

Digitized by Google

term "Judah," is understood as signifying the well-known holy city in that kingdom, having no reference to the church and followers of Christ. In the second place, if the Editor understands by the term "Jerusalem," here, the church of Christ, and admits of Jerusalem being figuratively called "Jehovah our righteousness," on the ground that Christ is its head, and that, consequently, it bears that name "to the *honor* of her glorious *head*," though, in reality, different from and subordinate to him, how can he reject the figurative application of the phrase "Jehovah our righteousness" to Jesus, on the same ground and same principle, which is, that as Jehovah is the head of Christ, consequently Christ bears this name "to the honor of his *head*," though, in reality, different from and subordinate to God? Vide 1 Cor. xi. 3: "But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ, and the head of the woman is the man, and the HEAD OF CHRIST IS GOD."

The Editor shews an instance in Isaiah, in which seven women wish to be called by the name of a husband, to have their reproach taken away. He must also know, that thousands of sons and descendants are called by the name of one of their fathers, and servants by the name of their masters, to the honor of the father or the master. Vide Isaiah xlviii. 1; Gen. xliii. 6; Hosea xi. 8, 9; Exod. xxiii. 21. The Editor then proceeds to divide the honorary names, found in scripture, into two kinds; one given by men, and the other given by God; but he must know that the names given by prophets, or by common men, if used and confirmed by God.

Digitized by Google

or by any of the sacred writers, become as worthy of attention as if they had been bestowed originally by the Deity himself.

The Editor again uses the following words, "The incommunicable name Jehovah," the self-existent, from the verb הוה *hawah*, "to be or to exist," "which is applied to no one throughout the scripture besides the sacred three," &c. We know very numerous instances in which the name "Jehovah" is applied to the most sacred God, but never met with an instance of applying to two other sacred persons the simple term "Jehovah." I wish the Editor had been good enough to have taken into consideration that this is the very point in dispute, and to have shown instances in which the second and third persons of the deity (according to the Editor's expression) are addressed by this name. He further observes, that "no one supposes that Jehovah-Jireh, "God will see or provide," given by Abraham to the place where he offered Isaac, was intended to deify that place, but to perpetuate the fact that the Lord did there provide a sacrifice instead of Isaac; —that Jehovah-nissi, "God, my banner," given by Moses to his altar, intended any thing more than that God was his banner against the Amalekites;—that Jehovah-tsidkenu, "Jehovah our righteousness," the name men should call Jerusalem, or Christ's church, was intended to deify her, but to demonstrate that her Lord and head, who is righteousness, is indeed Jehovah." Here I follow the very same mode of interpretation, adopted by the Editor, in explaining the same phrase, "The Lord our right-

Digitized by Google

eousness," found in Jer. xxiii. 6, referred to the Messiah; that is, the application of this phrase to the Messiah does not deify him, but demonstrates, that his Father, his EMPLOYER, his HEAD, the Most High, who is his righteousness, is the Lord Jehovah; so that consistency cannot be overlooked which prevails through all the phrases of a similar nature; for as Christ is represented to be the head of his church, so God is represented to be the head of Christ, as I noticed in the foregoing page 176. Lastly, the Editor says, "Compound names, therefore, do not of themselves express deity, but they express facts more strongly than simple assertions or propositions." I am glad to observe, that he differs from a great many of his colleagues, in their attempt to deify the Messiah from the application of the above phrase to him; but as to the facts demonstrated by this phrase, they may be easily ascertained from comparing the application of it with that of exactly similar phrases to others, as I have just observed.

The Editor now mentions (page 583) a few more passages which, he thinks, tend to "illustrate, not so much the name as the divine nature of the Son. In Jer. v. 22, we have this expostulation; 'Fear ye not me? saith the Lord. Will ye not tremble at my presence, who have placed the sand for the bound of the sea, by a perpetual decree, that it cannot pass it: and though the waves toss themselves, yet can they not prevail?' This, however, is only a part of that work of creation ascribed to him, who, while on earth, exercised absolute dominion over the winds and the waves in no name *beside his own*." But

Digitized by Google

what this passage of Jeremiah has to do with the divine nature of Jesus, I am unable to discover.—The Editor might have quoted, at this rate, all the passages of the Old Testament, that ascribe to God the supreme control over the whole world, as evidence in favor of the deity of Jesus, as he was sure to find always many persons of the same persuasion to applaud any thing offered in favor of the Trinity.

As to his position, that Jesus "exercised absolute dominion over the winds and the waves in no name beside his own," I beg to quote John x. 25, to shew, that whatever power Jesus, in common with other prophets, exercised over wind and water while he was on earth, he did it in the *name of God:* "Jesus answered them, I told you, and ye believed not; the works that I do *in my Father's name*, they bear witness of me." "And Jesus lifted up his eyes and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me." I say Jesus, in common with other prophets, because both Elijah and Elisha the prophets, exercised power over wind and water and other things, like Jesus, in the name of the Father of the universe. 1 Kings xvii. 1, xviii. 44, 45; 2 Kings ii. 21; sometimes without verbally expressing the name of God; ch. v. 8—13, 27, ch. ii. 10.

Upon the assertion in my Second Appeal, that the "epithet God is frequently applied in the sacred scriptures to others beside the Supreme Being," the Editor observes, that "this objection Jeremiah cuts up, ch. x. 11: 'The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, even they shall perish from the earth, and from under these heavens;' which

Digitized by Google

declaration sweeps away not only the gods of the heathen, but all magisterial gods, and even Moses himself, as far as he aspired to the godhead: but from this general wreck of our author's gods, Christ is excepted, he having made these heavens, and laid the foundation of the earth." Let us apply this rule adopted by the Editor respecting the prophets, to Jesus Christ. We do not find him once represented in the scriptures as the maker of heavens and earth; this peculiar attribute having been throughout the whole sacred writings ascribed exclusively to God the Most High. As to the instances pointed out by the Editor, Heb. i. 10, and Col. i. 17, I fully explained them in pp. 97, 98 and 101, as having reference to God the Father of the universe. Moreover, we observe in the New Testament, even in the same book of Hebrews, that whatever things Jesus made or did, he accomplished as an instrument in the hands of God. Heb. i. 2: "Whom he hath *appointed* heir of all things, *by* whom also he *made* the worlds." Eph. iii. 9: "Who *created* all things *by* Jesus Christ." It would, indeed, be very strange to our faculties to acknowledge one as the true God, and yet to maintain the idea that he created things by the directions of another being, and was appointed as heir of all things by that other. Again, in pursuance of the same rule of the Editor, I find that Jesus, like other perishable gods, both died and was buried, though raised afterwards by his Father, who had the power of raising Elijah to heaven, even without suffering him to die and be buried for a single day. My readers may now judge whether Jesus Christ be not in-

Digitized by Google

cluded, in common with other perishable gods, in the rule laid down by the Editor.

To deify Jesus Christ, the Editor again introduces the circumstance of his being a searcher of hearts, to execute judgment, Rev. ii. 23, and also quotes Heb. i. 3. Having examined these arguments in pages 99 and 162, I will not return to them here.

He adds, in this instance, "We are hence assured that the Father, who perfectly knows the Son, did not commit to him all judgment so entirely as to judge no man himself, without knowing his infinite fitness for the work." It is evident that the Father did not commit to the Son all judgment so entirely as to judge no man himself, without qualifying him for so doing, that is, without giving him the power of knowing all the events of this world in order to the distribution of rewards and punishments. Matt. xxviii. 18: "*All power* is *given* unto me in heaven and in earth." Notwithstanding this, the power of knowing those things that do not respect the execution of judgment by the Son, is not bestowed upon him, and the Son, therefore, is totally ignorant of them. Mark xiii. 32: "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man; no, not the angels which are in heaven; *neither the Son*, but the Father." No one destitute of the power of omniscience is ever acknowledged as Supreme God by any sect that believe in revealed religion.

He quotes Heb. iv. 13, "Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight; but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do," in order to corroborate

Digitized by Google

the idea that Christ knew all the secrets of men. Supposing this passage to be applicable to Jesus Christ, it does not convey any other idea than what is understood by Rev. ii. 23, which I have already noticed. But the Editor must know that in the immediately preceding verse, the word of God, or Revelation, while figuratively represented as a two-edged sword, &c. is in the same allegorical sense declared to be "a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." There is, therefore, no inconsistency in ascribing the knowledge of the intents of hearts to him through whom that revelation is communicated, and who is appointed to judge whether the conduct of men is regulated by them in conformity to that Revelation.

The Editor says, (page 584,) that "in Ezek. xxviii. God says, respecting a man who arrogated to himself the honors of Godhead, 'Son of man, say unto the prince of Tyrus, Thus, saith the Lord God;—Because thy heart is lifted up, and thou hast said I am a God,—behold, thou shalt die the death of the uncircumcised,' &c. How different the Father's language to the Son: 'Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever.' Why this different language to the prince of Tyrus and to Jesus?" Had the Editor attentively referred to the scriptures, he would not have taken the trouble of putting this question to me; for he would have easily found the reason for this difference; that is, the king of Tyrus called himself God, as above-stated; but Jesus, so far from robbing the Deity of his honor, never ceased to confess that God was both his God and his Father. (John xx. 17.)

Digitized by Google

Also, that the prince of Tyrus manifested disobedience to God; but Jesus even laid down his life in submission to the purposes of God, and attributed divine favor towards himself to his entire obedience to the Most High. Rom. v. 19: For as by one man's disobedience, many were made sinners, so by the *obedience of one* shall many be made righteous." John x. 17: "*Therefore* doth my Father love me, *because* I lay down my life, that I might take it again." Luke xxii. 42: "Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless, *not my will* but *thine* be done." As the conduct of the prince and that of Jesus towards God were quite different, they were differently treated by the Father of the universe: As to the above verse, ("Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever,") God does not peculiarly address Jesus with the epithet God, but he also uses for the chiefs of Israel and for Moses the same epithet.

The Editor quotes 1 Cor. iv. 5: "Judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the heart; and then shall every man have praise of God." The passage simply amounts to this: "Judge not either me or others before the time, until the Lord come, who will bring to light the dark and secret counsels of men's hearts, in preaching the gospel; and then shall every one have that praise, that estimate set upon him, by God himself, which he truly deserves."—*Locke.*

It is not Jesus alone that was empowered by God

Digitized by Google

to know and to judge all secret events; but, on particular occasions, others were intrusted with the same power, as has already been noticed in page 162 and will also be found in Dan. ii. 23: "I thank thee, and praise thee, O thou God of my fathers, who hast given me wisdom and might, and hast made known unto me now what we desired of thee; for thou hast now made known unto us the king's matter." And in 2 Sam. xiv. 19, 20: "And the king (David) said, Is not the hand of Joab with thee in all this? And the woman answered and said, My Lord is wise, according to the wisdom of an angel of God, to know all things that are in the earth." 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3: "Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? and if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters? Know ye not that we shall judge angels?" &c. Here Christian saints are declared to be judges of the deeds of the whole world, and of course to be possessors of a knowledge of all events, both public and private, so as to enable them to perform so delicate a judgment. Besides, a knowledge of future events is by no means less wonderful than that of past things or present secrets of hearts; yet we find all the prophets of God were endued with the former. 1 Kings xx. 22: "And the prophet came to the king of Israel, and said unto him, Go, strengthen thyself, and mark, and see what thou doest; for at the return of the year the king of Syria will come up against thee." So we find the same gift of future knowledge granted to righteous men in numerous instances.

Digitized by Google

He then cites Dan. i. and vii. and founds upon them the following question: "If, then, by nature he was not God, by nature the creator of heaven and earth, he and his kingdom must perish from under the heavens." To this my reply is, that we find Jesus subjected to the death of the cross while on earth, and, after the general resurrection, to Him that put all things under him. (1 Cor. xv. 28.) The *Son*, therefore, is not by nature God, the creator of heaven and earth. As to the sophistry that attributes the death and subjugation of Jesus only to his human capacity, it might be applicable to every human individual, alleging that they, being the children of Adam, the son of God, (Luke iii. 38,) are possessed of a divine nature also, and that their death, consequently, is in their human capacity alone, but that in their divine nature they cannot be subjected to death. (Vide pp. 113—118 of this Essay.)

By applying to Jesus the epithet "most holy," found in Dan. ix. 24, the Editor attempts to prove the eternal deity of the Son, forgetting, perhaps, that the same term "most holy" is applied in the scriptures even to inanimate things. Numb. xviii. 10: "In the most holy place shalt thou eat it." Exod. xxix. 37: "It shall be an altar most holy."

The Editor, in noticing Hosea, says, that "the evangelist's quoting this passage, ('Out of Egypt have I called my son,') plainly shows that it referred to Christ as well as to Israel; but the difference is manifest: Israel was God's adopted son, constantly rebelling against his Father; Jesus was God's proper son, of the same nature with his Father, (as is ev-

Digitized by Google

ery proper son,) and did always what pleased him." This assertion of the Editor, that "Israel was God's adopted son," is, I think, without foundation; for they are declared, like Jesus, to be begotten sons of God; but were not, like Christ, entirely devoted to the will of the Father of the universe. Deut. xxxii. 18: "Of the Rock that *begat* thee thou art unmindful, and hast forgotten God that formed thee." Exod. iv. 22: "And thou shalt say unto Pharaoh, Thus saith the Lord, Israel is my son, even *my firstborn.*" He then quotes Hosea iii. 5: "Afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the Lord their God, and David their king." On which he comments that David had then been in his grave—he could be sought only in heaven:—as David, in common with other saints, could not search the heart and know the sincerity of prayers, this prophecy must be assigned to the son of David, the Messiah. I really regret to observe, that as the Jews endeavor to misinterpret such passages as are most favorable to the idea of Jesus being the expected Messiah, so Christians, in general, try to refer to Jesus any passages that can possibly be explained as bearing the least allusion to their notion of the Messiah, however distant in fact they may be from such a notion. By so doing, they both only weaken their respective opinions. The above citation, on which the Editor now dwells, is an instance. Let us refer to the text of Hosea iii. 4: "For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and without teraphim." Ver. 5:

Digitized by Google

"Afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the Lord their God, and David their king, and shall fear the Lord and his goodness in the latter days." Does not the poetical language of the prophet determine to the satisfaction of every unbiassed man, that, after long sufferings, Israel will repent of their disobedience, and seek the protection of their God, and the happiness which their fathers enjoyed during the reign of David? as it is very natural for a nation or tribe, when oppressed by foreign conquerors, to remember their own ancient kings, under whose governments their fathers were prosperous, and to wish a return of their reign, if possible. If the Editor insist upon referring this prophecy to Jesus, he must wait its fulfilment; as Israel has not as yet sought Jesus, as the son of David, the Messiah, who was promised to them.

The Editor says, (page 586,) that Peter, in Acts ii. 21, applies to Jesus Joel ii. whereby he identifies Jehovah with him: but we find Peter here quoting only a part of Joel ii. 32: "And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved." So far from applying this to the Son, and identifying him with God, the apostle explains, in the immediately following verse, (22,) his nature, and his total subordination to God: "Ye men of Israel, hear these words; Jesus of Nazareth, a *man approved of God* among you by miracles and wonders and signs, which *God did by him* in the midst of you," &c. The Editor then adds, that Paul also addressed himself "to all who, in every place, call on the name of Jesus Christ our Lord." (1 Cor.

Digitized by Google

i. 2). I therefore quote Locke's paraphrase on this verse, as well as his note on Rom. x. 13, with a view to shew the Editor, that the phrase, "call on the name of Jesus," is not a correct translation in the English version. "To the church of God, which is at Corinth, to them that are separated from the rest of the world, by faith in Jesus Christ, called to be saints, with all that are every where called by the name of Jesus Christ, their Lord and ours." (*Locke* on 1 Cor. i. 2.) Note on Rom. x. 13, page 384: "Whosoever hath, with care, looked into St. Paul's writings, must own him to be a close reasoner, that argues to the point; and therefore, if, in the three preceding verses, he requires an open profession of the gospel, I cannot but think, that 'all that call upon him,' (verse 12,) signifies, all that are open, professed Christians; and if this be the meaning of 'calling upon him,' (ver. 12,) it is plain it must be the meaning of 'calling upon his name,' (ver. 13,) a phrase not very remote from 'naming his name,' which is used by St. Paul for professing Christianity. 2 Tim. ii. 19. If the meaning of the prophet Joel, from whom these words are taken, be urged, I shall only say, that it will be an ill rule for interpreting St. Paul, to tie up his use of any text he brings out of the Old Testament, to that which is taken to be the meaning of it there. We need go no farther for an example than the 6th, 7th, and 8th verses of this chapter, which I desire any one to read as they stand, (Deut. xxx. 11—14,) and see whether St. Paul uses them here, in the same sense." If the Editor still insists upon the accuracy of the translation of

Digitized by Google

the phrase, "call upon the name of Jesus," found in the version, he will, I hope, refer to Matt. x. 40—42: "He that receiveth you receiveth *me*, and he that receiveth *me* receiveth *him that sent me.* He that receiveth a prophet in the name of a prophet, shall receive a prophet's reward, &c.—And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only in the name of a disciple, verily, I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward;"—when he will perceive, that calling on the name of Jesus, as being the Messiah sent by God, is an indirect call on the name of God; in the same manner as one's yielding to a general sent by a king, amounts to his submission to the king himself, and secures for him the same favor of the king as if he had yielded directly to the sovereign.

The Editor then quotes Amos iv. 13, perhaps on account of its containing the phrase, "declaring unto man what is his thought." As I have noticed this subject already, oftener than once, pages 162 and 183, I will not return to it here.

He again quotes Zech. iii. 2: "And Jehovah said unto Satan, Jehovah rebuke thee, O Satan; even Jehovah that hath chosen Jerusalem, rebuke thee: Is not this a brand plucked out of the fire?" The Editor then proceeds to say, that "this passage, with ch. ii. 8, 'Thus saith the Lord of hosts, After the glory hath he sent me,' and ch. xiii. 7, 'Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, against the man who is my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts,' forms another three-fold testimony of the distinct personality of the Son, and his equality with the Father." I am

Digitized by Google

unable to discover exactly what the Editor intends by his two first two quotations. With respect to the former, that "Jehovah said unto Satan, Jehovah rebuke thee," &c. the Editor must be well aware that God speaks of himself, very frequently, throughout the sacred books, in the third person, instead of the first. Isaiah li. 1: "Hearken to me, ye that follow after righteousness, ye that seek the Lord," &c. 15: "But I am the Lord thy God, that divided the sea, whose waves roared: *The Lord* of hosts is *his* name." Even in this very book of Zechariah, we find that the prophet speaks of himself sometimes in the third person. Zech. i. 7: "In the second year of Darius, came the word of Jehovah unto Zechariah," &c. vii. 8: "And the word of the Lord came unto Zechariah, saying," &c. Neither God's nor Zechariah's speaking of himself, in the third person, in poetical language, can be construed into a proof of the plurality of either of their persons, or of the equality of either with some other being. The fact is, that Zechariah prophecies, in the second year of Darius, king of Persia, of the Lord's will to build the second temple of Jerusalem, by Joshua, Zerubbabel and Semuh; and to rebuke Satan, who would discourage Joshua, the high-priest, from that undertaking; as is evident from the following passage. Zech. i. 1: "In the eighth month, in the second year of Darius, came the word of the Lord to Zechariah," &c. 16: "Therefore, thus saith the Lord, I am returned to Jerusalem with mercies; my house shall be built in it, saith the Lord of hosts, and a line shall be stretched forth upon Jerusalem."

Digitized by Google

ii. 2: "Then said I, Whither goest thou? And he said unto me, To measure Jerusalem," &c. iii. 1, 2: "And he shewed me Joshua the high-priest standing before the angel of the Lord, and Satan standing at his right hand to resist him. And the Lord said unto Satan, The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan; even the Lord that hath chosen Jerusalem, rebuke thee: is not this a brand plucked out of the fire?" As to Zerubbabel, the prophet says, iv. 9, "The hands of Zerubbabel have laid the foundation of this house; his *hands* shall also *finish it*," &c. Respecting Semuh, vi. 12, 13, "Thus speaketh the Lord of hosts, saying, Behold the man whose name is Semuh; and he shall grow up out of his place, and *ye* shall build the temple of the Lord: Even he shall build the temple of the Lord; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne: and the counsel of peace shall be between them both,"—that is, between Semuh and Joshua, mentioned in the immediately preceding verse 11. In the English version the meaning of the name of Semuh is used, viz. "Branch," instead of Semuh itself, both here and in ch. iii. 8, and the commentators choose to apply the name thus translated to Jesus, though no instance can be adduced of Jesus Christ's having been so called, and though the prophet expressly says, in ch. vi. 12, "whose name is Semuh." He is speaking of the SECOND building of the temple, which began in the reign of Darius, king of Persia, long before the birth of Christ. Vide the whole book of Zechariah.

The second quotation is, "For thus saith the

Digitized by Google

Lord of hosts, After the glory hath he sent me unto the nations which spoiled you; for he that toucheth you, toucheth the apple of his eye." (ii. 8.) The prophet here communicates to the people the words of God; that "after he has sent me with his will, to the nations who tyrannize over Israel, that* he who touches Israel touches the apple of his own eye." Zechariah very often, in his book, introduces himself as being sent by God; but how the Editor, from these circumstances, infers the separate personality of the Son, or his equality with the Father, he will, I hope, explain. If he insists upon the equality of the Most High, with him who says, in the verse in question, "After the glory hath he sent me," (upon some ground that we know nothing of,) he would be sorry to find at last, that he equalizes Zechariah, instead of Jesus, with God. I will, according to the plan already adopted, notice the third quotation, "Awake, O sword," (xiii. 7,) in a subsequent chapter, among the other passages alluded to in the second chapter of this work.

CHAPTER IV.

On the Editor's Replies to the Arguments contained in Chapter II. of the Second Appeal.

To my inquiry, in the Second Appeal, "Have we not his (Christ's) own express and often repeated avowal, that all the powers he manifested were committed to him as the Son, by the Father of the

* The word כי in the original Hebrew, signifies "that," as well as "for." See Parkhurst's Hebrew Lexicon.

Digitized by Google

universe?" the Editor thus replies in the negative (page 568:) "No;—that he was appointed by the Father to act as mediator between him and sinners, we have already seen; for without this he could have been no mediator between his Father and his offending creatures." Every unbiassed man may easily pronounce, whether it is consistent with any rational idea of the nature of the Deity, that God should be appointed by God, to "act the part of a mediator," by "laying *aside* his *glory*, and taking on himself the form *of a servant*;" and may discern, whether it is not most foreign to the notion of the immutable God, that circumstances could produce such a change in the condition of the Deity, as that he should have been not only divested of his glory for more than thirty years, but even subjected to servitude. Are not the ideas of supreme dominion and that of subjection, just as remote as the east from the west? Yet the Editor says, that while he was stripping himself of his glory, and taking upon himself the form a servant, he was just as much Jehovah as before.

The Editor, in common with other Trinitarians, conceives, that God the Son, equally with God the Father, (according to their mode of expression,) is possessed of the attributes of perfection, such as mercy, justice, righteousness, truth, &c. yet he represents them so differently as to ascribe to the Father strict justice, or rather vengeance; and to the Son, unlimited mercy and forgiveness, that is, the Father, the first person of the Godhead, having been in wrath at the sinful conduct of his offending

Digitized by Google

creatures, found his mercy so resisted by justice, that he could not forgive them at all, through mercy, unless he satisfied his justice by inflicting punishment upon these guilty men; but the Son, the second person of the Godhead, though displeased at the sins of *his offending creatures*, suffered his mercy to overcome justice, and by offering his own blood as an atonement for their sins, he has obtained for them pardon without punishment; and by means of vicarious sacrifice, reconciled them to the Father, and satisfied his justice and vengeance. If the justice of the Father did not permit his pardoning sinful creatures, and reconciling them to himself, in compliance with his mercy, unless a vicarious sacrifice was made to him for their sins; how was the justice of the Son prevailed upon by his mercy, to admit their pardon, and their reconcilation to himself, without any sacrifice, offered to him as an atonement for their sins? It is then evident, that, according to the system of Trinitarians, the Son had a greater portion of mercy than the Father, to oppose to his justice, in having his sinful creatures pardoned, without suffering them to experience individual punishment. Are these the doctrines on which genuine Christianity is founded? God forbid!

If the first person be acknowledged to be possessed of mercy equally with the second, and that he, through his infinite mercy towards his creatures, sent the second to offer his blood as an atonement for their sins, we must then confess that the mode of the operation and manifestation of mercy by the first is strange, and directly opposite to that adopted

Digitized by Google

by the second, who manifested his mercy even by the sacrifice of life, while the first person displayed his mercy only at the death of the second, without subjecting himself to any humiliation or pain.

In answer to the Editor's position, that Jesus, even as a mediator, was possessed of every power and perfection that was inherent in his divine nature. I only beg to remind him of a few sacred passages among many of a similar nature. John iii. 35: "The Father loveth the Son, and hath GIVEN all things into his hand." Ch. xvii. 22: "And the glory which thou GAVEST me, I have given them," &c. Ch. v. 26: "For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he GIVEN to the Son to have life in himself." Luke i. 32: "And the Lord shall GIVE UNTO him the throne of his father David." Matt. ix. 8: "But when the multitude saw it, they marvelled, and glorified God, who *had given such* power to MEN." Ch. xxviii. 18: "Jesus came, and spake unto them, saying, *All power* is GIVEN unto *me* in heaven and in earth." On these texts I trust no commentary is necessary to enable any one to determine, whether all the power and glory that Jesus enjoyed were given him by God, or were inherent in his own nature.

The Editor again denies Christ's having "possessed a single power, perfection, or attribute, which was not eternally inherent in his divine nature;" and defies me "to point out one attribute or perfection in the Father, which from scripture testimony the Son has not been already shown to possess." I therefore take upon myself to point out a few instances which, I hope, will convince the Editor that

Digitized by Google

the peculiar attributes of God were never ascribed to Jesus, nor to any other human being who may have been, like Jesus, figuratively call gods in scriptural language. In the first place, the attribute of being the "Most High" or עליון by which the supreme Deity is distinguished above all gods, is not found once ascribed to Jesus, though invariably applied to the Father throughout the scriptural writings. 2dly. Jesus was never called almighty, or שדי a term peculiarly used for the Deity. Nay, moreover, he expressly denies being possessed of almighty power, Matt. xx. 23: "But to sit on my right hand, and on my left, IS NOT MINE TO GIVE, but to them for whom it is PREPARED of MY FATHER." Ch. xxvi. 53: "Thinkest thou that I cannot now PRAY TO MY FATHER, and *he* shall presently GIVE ME more than twelve legions of angels?" John xi. 41: "Then they took away the stone from the place where the dead was laid; and Jesus lifted up his eyes, and said, Father, I *thank thee* that *thou hast heard me.*" He also denies his omniscience, Mark xiii. 32: "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man; no, not the angels which are in heaven, *neither* the *Son*, but the Father." Any being if not supreme, almighty, and omniscient, and, more especially, one subjected to the transitions of birth and death, must, however highly exalted, even by the title of a god, and though for ages endowed with all power in heaven and in earth, be considered a created being, and, like all creatures, be in the end, as the apostle declares, subject to the Creator of all things. Besides, in the creed which the generality of Trinitarians profess,

Digitized by Google

God is described as self-existent, having proceeded from none; but the Son, on the contrary, is represented as proceeding from the Father. Here even the orthodox amongst Christians ascribe the attribute of self-existence to the Father of the universe alone.

In my Second Appeal I observed, that "the sun, although he is the most powerful and most splendid of all known created beings, has yet no claim to be considered identical in nature with God, who has given to the sun all the heat," &c.; to which the Editor replies, "What is the sun to his Maker?"—I wish he had also added, "but that which a son and creature is to his Father and Creator? "When he again inquires, saying, "If the sun has no claim to Godhead, has it's Maker none?" (alluding to Christ,) he might have recollected that neither the sun nor Jesus has ever arrogated to himself godhead, but that it is their worshippers that have advanced doctrines ascribing godhead and infinite perfection to these finite objects. Notwithstanding that we daily witness the power of the glorious sun in bringing into life, and preserving to maturity, an infinite variety of vegetable and animal objects, yet our gratitude and admiration recognise in him only a being instrumental in the hands of God, and we offer worship and duty to him alone, who has given to the sun all the light and animating warmth which he sheds on our globe. On the same ground, whether we understand from scriptural authority, that the supreme Deity made through Jesus Christ all the things belonging to the Christian dispensation, or every thing relating to this visible world, (as interpreted by the *worshippers* of Jesus,)

Digitized by Google

we must not, in either case, esteem him as the supreme Deity, in whose hand he is represented by the same scriptures but as an instrument.

The Editor says, that though the power of effecting a material change, without the aid of physical means, be peculiar to God, "yet this power Christ not only possessed, but bestowed on his apostles." Supposing Jesus alone had the power of effecting material changes without the aid of physical means, and of bestowing on others the same gift, it could have proved only his being singular in the enjoyment of this peculiar blessing of God, and not his being identical or equal with Him who conferred such a power on him; but it is notorious that Jesus was not at all peculiar in this point. Were not the miracles performed by Joshua and Elijah, as wonderful as those done by Jesus? Did not Elijah bestow on his servant Elisha the power of effecting changes without physical means, by putting his own spirit on him? Is Elijah, from the possession of this power, to be considered an incarnation of the supreme Deity? 2 Kings ii. 9—12: "And it came to pass when they (Elijah, and Elisha) were gone over, that Elijah said unto Elisha, *Ask* what I *shall do* for thee before I be taken away from thee. And Elisha said, I pray thee, let a double portion of thy spirit be upon me. And he said, Thou hast asked a hard thing, nevertheless if thou see me when I am taken from thee, *it shall be so unto thee;* but if not, it shall not be so.—And Elijah was taken up by a whirlwind into heaven. And Elisha saw it, and he cried, My father, my father," &c. Vers. 14, 15: "And when he had smitten the

Digitized by Google

waters, they parted hither and thither, and Elisha went over. When the sons of the prophets saw him, they said, The spirit of Elijah doth rest on Elisha. And they came to meet him, and bowed themselves to the ground before him." Besides, we find in the evangelical writings, that notwithstanding the power of performing miracles given by Jesus to his apostles, they could not avail themselves of such a gift, until their faith in God was become firm and complete: it is thence evident that God is the only source of the power and influence that one creature has over another. Matt. x. 1: "And when he had called unto him his twelve disciples, he gave them power against unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness, and all manner of disease." Ch. xvii. 16: "And I brought him (the lunatic child) to thy disciples, and they could not cure him." Vers. 19—21: "Then came the disciples to Jesus apart, and said, Why could not we cast him out? And Jesus said unto them, Because of your unbelief; for verily I say unto you, if ye have faith as a grain of mustard-seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to another place, and it shall remove, and nothing shall be impossible unto you. Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by *prayer* and fasting." Mark xi. 22: "And Jesus answering saith unto them, (his disciples,) *Have faith* in God; for verily I say unto you, that whosoever shall say unto this mountain, Be thou removed," &c.

In my Second Appeal I mentioned, that it is evident from the first chapter of Genesis, that "in the beginning of the creation, God bestowed on man his

Digitized by Google

likeness, and sovereignty over all living creatures. Was not his own likeness, and that dominion, peculiar to God, before mankind were made partakers of them? Did God then deify man by such a mark of distinction?" On which the Editor thus remarks: "It is in reality asking, Did God make him cease to be a creature by thus creating him? We presume he expects no answer." If the Editor acknowledges that God, by bestowing on man his peculiar likeness and dominion, did not make him cease to be a creature, is he not, according to the same principle, obliged to admit the opinion, that although God raised Jesus above all, and bestowed on him a portion of his peculiar power and influence, yet he did not make him cease to be a creature?

In my Second Appeal, (pages 157, 158,) I selected nineteen passages out of many, in which Jesus distinctly disavows the divine nature, and manifests his subordination to God; to which the Editor replies, "They can prove nothing to his purpose, till they shew that his thus becoming incarnate, changed that divine nature which he possessed from eternity," &c. I therefore take upon myself to ask the Rev. Editor, whether the following passages found among those already quoted, do not prove the entire humanity of the Son, or (in the words of the Editor) a complete change in his divine nature, if he was ever possessed of it? "As the Father *gave me commandment*, *even so I do*." "I CAN OF MINE OWNSELF DO NOTHING." "All that the Father *giveth me* shall *come* to *me*." "As my Father hath *taught me*, I *speak* these things." "*To my Father* and your Father, and

to my God and your God." "Behold *my servant* whom I have chosen." If these declarations do fall short of shewing the human nature of the person who affirms them, I, as well as the Editor, should be at a loss to point out any saying of any of the preceding prophets, that might tend to substantiate their humanity. The Editor may perhaps say, after the example of his orthodox friends, that these, as well as other sayings to the same effect, proceeded from Jesus in his human capacity. I shall then entreat the Editor to shew me any authority in the scriptures, distinguishing one class of the sayings of Jesus Christ, as man, from another set of the same author as God. Supposing Jesus was of a two-fold nature, divine and human, as the Editor believes him to be; his divine nature in this case, before his appearance in this world, must be acknowledged perfectly pure and unadulterated by humanity. But after he had become incarnate, according to the Editor, was he not made of a mixed nature of God and man, possessing at one time both opposite sorts of consciousness and capacity? Was there not a CHANGE of a pure nature into a mixed one? I will not, however, pursue the subject further now, as I have already fully noticed it in another place (pages 113 and 115.) The Editor adverts here to Heb. i. 10, 1 Cor. xv. 24, 25; but as I have examined the former in page 101 and the latter in page 104, I will not revert to the consideration of them in this place.

At page 589, the Editor thus censures me: "To say that in the mouth of the Father, 'forever and

Digitized by Google

ever' means only a limited period, is to destroy the eternity of God himself;" and he quotes, "Jehovah shall reign forever and ever." I have shown by numerous instances, both in my Second and in the present Appeal, that the terms "forever," "everlasting," when applied *to any one except God*, signify long duration: I therefore presume to think that the Editor might have spared this censure as being altogether undeserved. I will here, however, point out one or two more passages in the mouth of the Father, which contain the term "forever," and in which it can imply only long duration. Gen. xvii. 8: "And I will give unto thee, and unto thy seed after thee—all the land of Canaan, for an *everlasting* possession." Jer. vii. 7: "Then will I cause you to dwell in this place, in the land that I gave to your fathers *forever and ever*." Dan. vii. 18: "But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom forever, even forever and ever." Is the land of Canaan now in possession of Israel; and will it remain in their possession after all rule, authority, and power have been put down, and after the Son has delivered up his kingdom to God the Father of the universe? 1 Cor. xv. 24, 28.

The Editor in the course of this discussion notices Philip. ii. 6, whence he concludes that Jesus was in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to be equal with God, yet took upon himself the form of a servant, and became obedient to death; I will, therefore, first give the verse as it stands in the English version, and for the purpose of shewing the gradual progress of truth, I will add some subse-

Digitized by Google

quent translation of the same verse, by eminently learned Trinitarian authors, and finally transcribe it as found in the original Greek, with a verbal translation.

English version. Philip. ii. 6: "Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God."

Secondly. In a new translation from the original Greek, by James Macknight, D. D. verse 6 thus stands: "Who being in the form of God, did not think it robbery to be like God." So John Parkhurst, M. A. the author of a Greek and English Lexicon to the New Testament, who was also an orthodox writer, thus translates, conformably to the opinion of Drs. Doddridge and Whitby, two other celebrated orthodox writers, page 322: "Philipp. ii. 6, *το ειναι ισα Θεω*, to be as God. So *ισα Θεω* is most exactly rendered, agreeably to the force of *ισα* in many places in the LXX. which Whitby has collected in his note on this place. The proper Greek phrase for equal to God is *ισον τω Θεω*, which is used John v. 18:" 'Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God.' " (This is not the only instance that [in which] the Jews misunderstood Jesus, for in many other instances they misconceived his meaning. John ii. 19, 21; vi. 41, 42, 52, 60.)

The term, "to be like God," as it is used by several orthodox writers, neither amounts to an identity of one with the other, nor does it prove an equality of the former with the latter. Gen. i. 26:

Digitized by Google

"God said, Let us make man in our image, and after our *likeness*." 1 Chron. xii. 22: "At that time, day by day, there came to David to help him, until it was a great host, *like* the host of God." Ch. xxvii. 23: "The Lord had said that he would increase Israel *like* to the stars of heaven." Zech. xii. 8: "In that day shall the Lord defend the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and he that is feeble among them at that day shall be *as* David: and the house of David shall be *as* God, *as* the angel of the Lord before them." 1 John iii. 2: "But we know that when he shall appear, we shall be *like him*," &c.

Another Trinitarian author, Schleusner, in his Lexicon to the New Testament, renders the passage "non habuit prædæ loco similitudinem cum Deo," "He did not esteem likeness to God in the place of a prey." The substance of this translation is adopted in the Improved Version of the New Testament.

1 2 3
3dly. The original Greek runs thus: *῾Ος εν μορφη*
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
Θεου υ῾παρχων, ουχ᾽ α῾ρπαγμον ἡ᾽γησατο το ειναι ισα Θεω.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
"Who in form of God being, not robbery thought
9 10 11 12
the being like God." Which words, arranged according to the English idiom, will run thus: "Who being in the form of God, did not think of* the robbery the being like God." This interpretation is

* We find the verb *ηγεόμαι* implying to esteem as well as to think, with a simple accusative, [2] Peter iii. 9: *ως τινες βραδυτητα ηγουνται*, "as some men count slackness" (properly speaking, "think of slackness.")

Digitized by Google

most decisively confirmed by the context of the verse in question. Verse 3 of the same chapter: "Let nothing be done through strife or vain glory; but, *in lowliness of mind*, let each esteem other *better* than themselves." Ver. 4: "Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others." Ver. 5: "*Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus.*" Ver. 6: "Who, being in the form of God, did not think of the robbery of being like God." Ver. 7. "But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men." Where the sense of a passage is complete without introducing an additional word more than is expressed, no one, unless devoted to the support of some particular doctrine, would think of violating fidelity to the original text by interpolation in the translation. Here the apostle requires of us to esteem others better than ourselves, according to the example of humility displayed by Jesus, who, notwithstanding his godly appearance, never thought of those perfections by which he approached man's ideas of God, but even made himself of no reputation. It would be absurd to point out one's own opinion of his equality with God as an instance of humility. How can we be following the example of Christ, in thinking others better than ourselves, if he, as the orthodox say, did not think even his Father higher than himself? We, however, must not suffer ourselves to be misled by any such orthodox interpretation, to entertain so erroneous an idea of Christ's opinion of himself, bearing in mind that Jesus himself proclaims, "My Father is greater than I." John xiv. 28.

Digitized by Google

No one can be at a loss to understand the difference of essence between Christ and his creator God, implied in the phrase,—"Being in the form of God;" as the distinction between "being God," and "being in the form of God," is too obvious to need illustration. Even Parkhurst, one of the most zealous advocates for the Trinity, thought it absurd to lay stress on the term "being in the form of God," in support of the deity of Jesus Christ. (See page 443.) "*Μορφη*, perhaps from the Hebrew מראה *appearance*, and פה *aspect*. Outward appearance, form, which last word is from the Latin *forma*, and this, by transposition, from the Doric μορφα for μορφη. See Mark xvi. 12, (comp. Luke xxiv. 13,) Philipp. ii. 6, 7, where the 6th verse refers not, I apprehend, to Christ's being real and essential God, or essential Jehovah, (though that he is so is the foundation of Christianity,) but to his glorious appearance as God before and under the Mosaic dispensation."

Should any one, in defiance of the common acceptation of the word "form," and of every authority, insist upon its implying real essence in the phrase, "being in the form of God," he must receive it in the same sense in the following verse, "took upon himself the form of a servant;" and he *must then* admit and believe that Christ was possessed of the real essence of God and the real essence of a servant. How can we reconcile real Godhead with real servitude, even for a moment?

Nor can the phrase, "Was made in the likeness of man," in verse 7, be admitted to identify him with

Jehovah, any more than we can allow that Samson is so identified by the use of the parallel expression in Judges xvi. 7 and 17: "I shall be weak, and be as a man," "And be like any man." In the English version, the word *other* is found; that is, "be like *another* man;" which is not warranted by the original Hebrew, as Mr. Brown, an orthodox commentator, justly remarks in the margin.

The Editor says, (page 590,) "Relative to Christ's being the first-born of every creature, we reply with Dr. Owen, whose work on Socinianism has never been answered,—'It is not said Christ is πρωτοκτιστος, *first-created*, but πρωτοτοκος, *the first-born;* and Christ is so the first-born, as to be the only-begotten Son of God, is so the first of every creature, that is, he is before them all, above them all, heir to them all, and so no one of them.'" Although both "first-created," and "first-born," from the common acceptation of these words, equally imply a created nature, yet the reason for St. Paul's choice of the word "first-born" is obvious; for when used in reference to a creation not produced in the natural course, first-born signifies superiority to other creatures of the same class, and not "an only-begotten son," as Dr. Owen and the Editor seem to suppose. I will here point out the sense in which the word "first-born" is used in the scriptures when obviously not relating to natural birth. Exod. iv. 22, we find in the mouth of Jehovah himself, Israel designated by the terms, "my son, even my *first-born.*" Again, Jer. xxxi. 9: "I am a Father to Israel, and Ephraim is *my first-born.*" Psalm lxxxix. 27: "I

Digitized by Google

will make him (David) my *first-born*, higher than the kings of *the earth*." And now I will take upon myself to ask the Editor, whether Israel, as well as David, was so "first-born" as "to be the only-begotten son of God," and was also "before all the creatures, above them all, heir to them all, and so no one of them;" or whether that designation was not rather applied both to the nation and to the individual because they were principal persons, and to shew that they were respectively chosen of God above the rest of his creation? Rom. viii. 29: "For whom God did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the FIRST-BORN among many BRETHREN." St. John defines what would be understood by the term "to be *born of God*." Vide 1 John iv. 7: "Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God, and *every one that loveth is born of God*, and knoweth God." Hence Jesus is considered and declared to be the head of the children of God. So the term "only-begotten son" signifies most beloved among children, whether natural or spiritual, and not an only son of a father; as we find, in Heb. xi. 17, this very term applied to Isaac, though Abraham had another son by Hagar.

As to his assertion, "Christ is no one of them," (that is, of creatures,) I only quote a few passages, in which Jesus himself and his apostles enumerated him as "one of them." Matt. xxv. 40: "Verily, I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these *my brethren*, ye have done it unto me." Here it is the King and Lord, sitting

Digitized by Google

upon the throne of his glory at the last day, who is represented as styling the poor and helpless his brethren. Ch. xxviii. 10: "Then said Jesus unto them, Be not afraid. Go and tell *my* brethren that they go into Galilee; and there shall they see me." John xx. 17: "But go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend to my Father and to your Father, and to my God and your God." 1 Cor. ix. 5: "As the *brethren* of the Lord and Cephas." Heb. ii. 11: "For he that sanctifieth, and they that are sanctified, are *all of one* (Father); for which cause he is not ashamed to call them *brethren*." Ver. 12: "Saying, I will declare thy name unto *my brethren*. In the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee."

As to the Editor's reliance on the subsequent verses, to shew that the creation of all things was effected by Christ, I refer my readers to page 91 of this Essay, where I observe that the apostle Paul means, in these passages, only the creation of all the things in the Christian dispensation, as is explained in Eph. i. 21, 22, which represent Jesus as head over all things belonging to the church. I need not renew the subject of Revelations, repeated by the Editor, as I have already examined it in pages 162, 181.

I have shewn, in pages 156, 157, 158, that whatever power Jesus possessed either as man, Son of man, God, or Son of God, he received the same from the Father of the universe; therefore the assertion of the Editor, that ("certain powers were conferred on Jesus, not as a man, but as the Messiah, Christ, the anointed Son of God") is, I presume, one of the

Digitized by Google

mysteries of the doctrine of [the] Trinity. How can the Editor reconcile the passages, quoted in my Second Appeal, to this assertion? Let him answer what is there advanced, in the course of the discussion of this very subject, of a few points of which I beg to remind him.

1st. " In John xvii. 5, ' And now, O Father, glorify me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was,' with the same breath with which he prays for glory, he identifies the *nature* in which he does so, with that under which he lived with God before the creation of the world." Is not this petition to God for glory, by the same person, who says he was with God before the foundation of the world? Was he, before the foundation of the world, a man, or of a two-fold nature, human and divine? If he was God almighty before the foundation of the world, how could that God implore another being for the restoration of the glory, which he at one time had, but lost subsequently?

2dly. In John viii. 42, Jesus declares, that he came not of himself; but that God sent him. Does not he avow here, that his coming to this world was not owing to his own will, but to the will of another being? Was he not entirely at the disposal of God, the Most High, even before his coming into this world? In Heb. x. 5—7, the apostle declares, that Jesus, at the time of his coming to the world, saith, that God had prepared him a body, and that he comes to the world to do the *will of God.* Had he been God before he had come to this world, how

Digitized by Google

could he, in common with all other creatures, attribute his own actions to the will of the Supreme Disposer of all the events of the universe?

The Editor next quotes a part of Heb. i. 12, "Thou art the same." This I have fully noticed in page 102.

The Editor disapproves highly of my assertion, in the Second Appeal, "Christ was vested with glory from the beginning of the world." I therefore beg to quote one or two scriptural passages, which, I hope, will justify that assertion. 1 John ii. 13: "I write unto you, fathers, because ye have known him that is from the beginning." Rev. iii. 14: "These things saith the Amen, the beginning of the creation of God."

The Editor insinuates, that I have contradicted myself by "ridiculing the idea of Christ's having two natures," after I had declared that Christ "lived with God before the creation of the world," and that "it would have been idle to have informed them, (the Jews,) that, in his mere corporeal nature, Jesus was inferior to his Maker, and it must, therefore, have been his spiritual nature, of which he here avowed his inferiority to God." I cannot perceive what contradiction there is in the assertion, that Christ lived in the divine purpose and decree*

* On John xvii. 5. He had it (the same glory) with the Father before the world was, that is, in the Father's purpose and decree. In the language of scripture, what God determines to bring to pass, is represented as actually accomplished; thus, the dead are represented as living, Luke xx. 36—38. Believers are spoken of as already glorified, Rom. viii. 29, 30. Things that are not, are called as though they were, Rom. iv. 17. And in verse 12 of this chapter, Judas is said to be destroyed, though he was then living, and actually bargaining with the priests and rulers to betray his Master. See also verse 10; Eph. i. 4; 2 Tim. i. 9; Rev. xiii. 8; Heb. x. 34. (Improved Version.)

Digitized by Google

before the world was, and that he, not merely as a man, before the assuming of the office of the Messiah, was inferior to his Creator, but that he was so even after he had been endowed with the Holy Spirit in the river of Jordan, and with the power of performing miracles, which is said to be a spiritual gift.—Supposing he, like Adam, lived with God before his coming into this world, (according to the doctrines maintained by some Christians,) and afterwards was sent to the world, in the body of Jesus, for effecting human salvation, as John the Baptist was esteemed to be Elijah, even this doctrine does not preclude us from rejecting the idea of a two-fold nature of God and man.

The Editor says, that when "he (Jesus) emptied himself of his glory, did he lay aside his divine nature, of which his glory was merely a shadow?" and then he recommends me to reflect, for a moment, on what the term glory implies; "understood either of praise or grandeur, it is merely the reflection or indication of a glorious nature." I have reflected, for some years past, and do now seriously reflect, on the divine nature, but I find it inconsistent with any idea I can admit of the eternal and unchangeable Almighty, that he should empty himself of his glory, (call it praise or grandeur, which you like,) though for a season, and should afterwards offer supplications for the same glory to himself, as if another being; addressing that other self as his own father; since God is often declared to have hardened the heart of men so [as] to disqualify them from perceiving his glory, instead of having degraded himself

Digitized by Google

by setting aside his own title to praise, or the grandeur which is inherent in his nature.

The Editor adds, "If it was *deserved* glory, it was that of which his nature was worthy, and the Father's giving it to him, when no being existed beside *the sacred three*, was the Father's attestation to the Son's eternal Godhead." If the Father's giving to Jesus deserved glory, should be acknowledged as amounting "to his attestation to the Son's Godhead," we must be under the necessity of admitting the attestation of Jesus to the eternal deity of his apostles, from the circumstance of his having given them the *same deserved glory*;—John xvii. 22, "And the glory which thou hast *given me* I have given them," &c.

The Editor twice says, that "Micah informs us that the Son is from everlasting." I wish he had mentioned the chapter and verse to which he alludes, that I might have examined the passage.

He perhaps alludes to the phrase "everlasting," found in the English version, in Micah v. 2, "Out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel, whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting." I will, therefore, quote Parkhurst's explanation of the original Hebrew word עלם which is translated in the English version "everlasting;" and then notice the translation of this very Hebrew word, in many other instances, by the authors of the English version; and lastly, I will repeat the context, that my readers may be able to judge whether any stress can be laid on the phrase alluded to by the Editor.—First, from Parkhurst's

Digitized by Google

Hebrew and English Lexicon, "עלם and עולם are used both as nouns and participles, for time hidden and concealed from man, as well indefinite, Gen. xvii. 8, 1 Sam. xiii. 13, 2 Sam. xii. 10, and eternal, Gen. iii. 22, Ps. ix. 8, as finite, Exod. xix. 9, xxi. 6, 1 Sam. i. 22, comp. ver. 28, 1 Sam. xxvii. 12, Isa. xxxii. 14; as well past, Gen. vi. 4, Deut. xxxii. 7, Josh. xxiv. 2, Psalm xli. 14, cxiii. 3, Prov. viii. 23, as future. It seems to be *much more frequently* used for an *indefinite*, than for *infinite*, time. Sometimes it appears particularly to denote the continuance of the Jewish dispensation or age, Gen. xvii. 13, Exod. xii. 14, 24, xxvii. 21, and *al. freq.* and sometimes the period of time to the Jubilee, which was an eminent type of the completion of the Jewish and typical dispensation, by the coming and death of Christ." 2dly, the author of this Lexicon (though devoted to the cause of the Trinity) gives the translation of the term עולם found in Micah v. 2. In the course of explaining the force of the word יצא says he, "Micah v. 1, or 2, ומוצאתיו and his (the Messiah's) goings forth have been from of old, מימי עולם from the days of antiquity." 3dly, from the English version, Isaiah lxiii. [11], "Then he remembered the *days of old*," or ימי עולם, exactly as is found in Micah v. 2. 1 Sam. xxvii. 8, "Those nations were of old," for the same Hebrew term עולם. Deut. xxxii. 7, "Remember the *days of old*," for the same Hebrew word. Gen. vi. 4, "Which were of old, men of renown," for the same term עולם. Psalm lxxvii. 5, "I have considered the days of old, and the years of ancient times." Here the term קדם

Digitized by Google

which is rendered in Micah v. 2, "*of old*," and the term עולם translated in the same verse "*everlasting*," are both mentioned. 4thly, the context is verses 2—4: "Whose goings forth have been, from [of] old, from everlasting; therefore will he give them up, until the time that she which travaileth hath brought forth; [then] the remnant of his brethren shall return unto the children of Israel: and he shall stand and feed in the strength *of the Lord*, in the majesty of the name of the Lord his God," &c. Can the phrases, "*his God*," "*in the strength of the Lord*," and "*his brethren*," be consistently used for one who is the everlasting God? If so, how can we reconcile to our understanding the idea of the everlasting God's reigning in the strength of another, having the Jews as his brethren, and looking up to another superior, who is designated by "his God"? If a body of men, distinguished for their talents, learning, and situation in life, from time to time, be determined to support their long-established inventions, in defiance of scripture, reason, and common sense; how can truth make its appearance, when so violently resisted? In fact, verse 2d of Micah thus correctly stands: "Out of thee (Bethlehem) shall he (the last-expected Messiah) come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel, whose sources* of springing forth have been from of ancient, from the days of old."

* These are the seed of Abraham and that of David, through which God declares, by the mouths of the ancient prophets, that he will raise the Messiah to save the world.—Vide Parkhurst's Hebrew Lexicon, "3, The place whence any thing comes. Job xxviii. 1, Isaiah lviii. 11, Psalm lxv. 9, lxxv. 7; in which last passage, מוצא is used for that part of the heavens whence the solar light יצא cometh forth, i. e. the east. Comp. Ps. xix. 6,

The Editor advances, that "even son" implies an equality of nature with the Father: certainly it does so, when referred to one carnally begotten, but otherwise it signifies a distinguished creature. 1 Chron. xxviii. 6: "And he said unto me, Solomon thy son, he shall build my house and my courts: for I have chosen him to be *my son*, and I will be his father." Job i. 6: "When the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord," &c. Is Solomon, because he is called a son of God, to be considered a partaker of the divine nature? Are the angels, designated "the sons of God," considered to be of the same nature with the Deity? The Editor, however, adds, (page 594,) "Our author hints, that in the sacred writings others have been termed the sons of God: this, however, only proves, that Christ is, by nature, the Son of God, while all others are the sons of God by adoption, or metaphorically." To establish Christ's being the only Son of God, he quotes Rom. viii. 32, in which Christ is termed God's own son; and John i. 16, where he says, that "the Holy Spirit also terms him, not merely the only son, but the only-begotten son of the Father." I therefore quote here verse 32 in question, with the preceding verse of the same chapter of Romans: "What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us? He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?" Here St. Paul proves, beyond doubt, the unlimited mercy of God towards

7." Parkhurst also rejects the popular meaning, saying, "Not his (Messiah's) eternal generation from the Father, as this word has been tortured to signify."

Digitized by Google

men, as manifested by his appointment of his own Son to save mankind from death, at the risk of the life of that son, without limiting the honor of a spiritual birth to Jesus, and denying to others the same distinction, who, in common with Jesus, enjoy it according to unquestionable sacred authorities. Deut. xxxii. 18: "Of the Rock that *begat* thee thou art unmindful." Exodus iv. 22: "*Israel is my son, even my first-born.*" 2 Sam. vii. 14: "I will be his (Solomon's) father, and he shall be *my son.* If he commit *iniquity*, I will *chasten him* with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men." Did St. Paul mean to destroy the validity of these, as well as of many other texts to a similar effect, by representing Christ as the *only* being distinguished by the title of Son of God, and excluding angels, Adam, Israel, Solomon, and David, from this spiritual dignity? I firmly believe he did not.

If a king, who had several children, sent one of them to fight battles against those who committed depredations on his subjects, and his son so sent, gained a complete victory in that war, but with the loss of his own life; and if, with a view to exalt or magnify the attachment of this sovereign to his people, one of his subjects declares that his sovereign was so deeply interested in the protection of his people as to send his own son, even the most beloved, to repel the enemies at the hazard of his life, and that he had not spared his own son in securing the lives of his people: does he confine the royal birth to that son, or does he degrade other sons of the king from that dignity? I beg my readers will

Digitized by Google

read. Rom. viii. 31, 32, and reflect upon their purport.—Besides, we find in the original Hebrew, Gen. i. 27, "God created man in *his image*," and in the English version, "*in his own image*."

Did the original writer of Genesis mean, that God created man in some fictitious or adopted image resembling that of God? Did the authors of the English version violate the original construction by adding the word "*own*," to the phrase "in his image?" Or did they add it only for the energy of expression? Psalm lxvii. 6: "God, even our *own* God, shall bless us."—Does the writer here exclude God from being the God of the world, by the use of the word *own* in the verse, against the declaration of Paul? Rom. iii. 29, "Is he the God of the Jews only? Is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also." Or does he use this word to shew the Israelites' especial attachment to God? In 1 Tim. i. 2, Paul uses the expression, "Timothy, my *own* son in the faith." Did he thereby exclude his thousands of spiritual disciples from being his sons in the faith?

In reply to his allusion to John i. 16, in which Jesus is said to be "the only-begotten Son of the Father," I beg to refer the Editor to Heb. xi. 17: "By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac; and he that had received the promises offered up his only-begotten son." Whence he may perceive that the phrase "only-begotten," implies only most beloved among the children, as Abraham had, at that time, another son beside Isaac, namely, Ishmael, by Hagar, given to him as his wife, Gen. xvi.

Digitized by Google

3, 15. Were we to take the word of John, "only-begotten," in its literal sense, in defiance of Heb. xi. 17, we must discredit the express word of God, declaring Israel his begotten and first-born son, and describing David to be his begotten son.

It is worth noticing, that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, applies the last phrase, "begotten son," in an accommodated sense to Jesus, Heb. i. 5. I say, in an accommodated sense, since, in Psalm ii. 7, it is David that declares, during the prosperous time of his reign, "The Lord hath said unto me, Thou art *my son*, *this day* have I begotten thee." Besides, how can the orthodox Christians, who consider Jesus as the begotten Son of God from eternity, with consistency maintain the opinion, that God had begotten him, at a particular day, during the reign of David? They may, perhaps, apply some of their mysterious interpretations to this passage of the Psalms; but they will, of course, in that case, pardon my inability to comprehend them. I will not return to the subject of Rev. i. 8, and Heb. i. 10, though the Editor recurs to them in this place.

As to his frequent repetition of such phrases as "Jesus is Jehovah God," "a tremendous being in his wrath," &c., I only say, they are best calculated to work upon the minds of those that are brought up in the notion of the Trinity, but do not carry any weight with them, in an argument subject to the decision of an enlightened public.

I asserted in my Second Appeal, that Jesus removed the doubt that arose with regard to the sense in which the unity should be taken in John x.

Digitized by Google

30, ("I and my Father are one,") by representing the unity so expressed to be such as he prayed might exist amongst his apostles, which was, of course, the unity of will and design, and not identity of being, as is evident from John xvii. 11, "that they [may] be *one* as *we are*," and verse 22, "that they may *be one*, even as *we are one*;" on which the Editor makes the following remarks.

"The declaration, John xvii. 22, 'that they [may] be one even as we are one,' was made at a time, and to persons totally different from that in John x. 30, 'I and my Father are one;' the latter was made to the gainsaying Jews, and the former in prayer to his heavenly Father; nor is there the least hint given that any doubt had arisen among the disciples respecting the expression 'I and my Father are one.'" It astonishes me very much to meet with a new rule laid down by the Editor, that no commentary upon, or explanation of a passage or phrase by the author of it, can have any weight, if it is made or given at a subsequent period in the course of a solemn prayer to God, or before a body of new hearers, without an express declaration of their doubts as to the meaning of it. If this rule stand good, many commentaries and notes by authors on their respective works, must cease to be of use, and the universally adopted rule, that passages of scripture should be explained by their reference to one another, must be annulled. In ch. x. 30, "I and my Father are one," Jesus declares unity to subsist between himself and God; and in ch. xvii. 11 and 22, by praying that "they (his disciples) may be one, as he and the

Digitized by Google

Father are one," he explains that the unity between him and the Father was of the same kind as that which he prayed to be granted to his disciples; hence by the unity so prayed for, cannot be meant any thing else than unity of will and design. Although that unity may not be of the same degree that subsisted between him and the Father, yet the force of the preposition "AS" shews that it is of the same kind.

Jesus could not mean in praying for his apostles verse 11, an unity in nature among them, whence we might have inferred unity in nature between him and his God; since they were long before this prayer created in the one human nature; nor could he pray for a renewed spiritual nature to be given to them, (as the Editor thinks to be the case,) because they were already endued with that spiritual union, as is evident from the passage of the very chapter, (xvii. [6, 8, 16, 22,]) "They have kept thy word." —"And have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst *send me.*"—"They *are not of the world, even as I am not of the world.*"—"The glory which thou gavest me, *I have given them.*" Besides, unity in spiritual nature is not the same kind of unity which subsists between the individuals of one nature.

Supposing unity of nature existed between God and Jesus Christ, (as the Editor believes,) in the same manner as it is found in one begotten by a man or animal, and his parents, and that Jesus actually meant by the words, "my Father," in verse 30, to affirm God to be his real Father, would it not be

Digitized by Google

quite idle in Jesus to have declared, that he as a Son was of the same nature with his Father, instead of saying that he was a Son entertaining the same will and design with his Father, since the former circumstance is natural and obvious, but the latter is not always found to exist, as we daily find among the children of men? Were the circumstance of one's calling God his Father received as a proof of his being actually the son of God, and, of course, of his unity in nature with the Deity, we must consider *David* as a real son of God, and of the same nature. Psalm lxxxix. 26: "He shall cry unto me, Thou art MY FATHER, my God, and the rock of my *salvation*;" and we also must esteem Israel one in nature with God; (Jer. iii. 4, "Wilt thou not from this time cry unto me, MY FATHER, thou art the guide of my youth?") We must even admit all Christians to be one in nature with the Father of the universe, for we are taught to pray to OUR FATHER in heaven, Matt. vi. 9. See also verses 1, 4, 6, 8, 14, 15, 18, and 32 of the same chapter. John xx. 17: "My Father and your Father," &c. 2 Cor. i. 3: "The Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," and "the Father of mercies," &c. To enable my readers to take a clear view of this passage, I here quote the context, as well as the note found in the Improved Version upon it. Vers. 29, 30: "My Father, who gave them me, is greater than all: and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand. I and my Father are one:" that is, "To snatch my true disciples out of my hand would be to snatch them out of my almighty Father's hand; because 'I and my Father

Digitized by Google

are one;' one in design, action, agreement, affection. See ch. xvii. 11, 21, 22. 1 Cor. iii. 8: 'Now he that planteth, and he that watereth are one.'" (Improved Version.) Both in the scriptures, and in ordinary composition, unity, when referred to two substances, implies invariably perfect concord of will, or some other qualities, and by no means oneness of nature,—a fact which my readers will perceive by a slight attention to the common usage of language, and also to the following verses: Gen. ii. 24: "And he (the husband) shall cleave unto his wife, and they two shall be *one flesh*." Ezek. xxxvii. 19: "I will take the stick of Joseph, and will put them with him, even with the stick of Judah, and make them ONE stick, and they shall be *one* in mine hand." 1 Cor. x. 17: "For we being many are *one* bread, and *one* body; for we are all partakers of that *one* bread."

I never amused myself with the thought that Christ did "pray that his disciples might be one with him and his heavenly Father," nor did I ever rejoice at the idea, that Jesus, "a man approved of God," was one in nature with the invisible Most High; I only observed in my Second Appeal, that if Trinitarian authors succeeded in their attempt to prove the deity of Jesus Christ from a perverted interpretation of such phrases as "the Father in me and I in him;" "he dwelleth in God, and God in him;" they would unavoidably increase the number of the persons of the godhead much beyond three, since similar expressions are frequently found applied to the disciples of Jesus. John xiv. 20: "At that day ye shall know, (addressing himself to his disci-

Digitized by Google

ples,) [that] I am in my Father, and ye *in me*, and I *in you*." Ch. xvii. 21: "Thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be *one in us*." John vi. 56: "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him." 1 John iv. 15: "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, *God dwelleth in him, and he in God*." 2 Peter i. 4: "That by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature."

The Editor seems displeased at my having declined to submit indiscriminately to my countrymen the whole doctrine of the New Testament, because certain passages therein, having undergone human distortions, occasion much dispute. I therefore beg to refer him to page 17 of this Essay, as well as to all church history, which shew that my plan was conformable to the example laid down by the apostles and primitive Christians, who used to accommodate their instructions to the gradual progress of their followers.

In answer to his question, "How was it that I did not feel struck with the absurdity of a creature's creating all things," &c.? I beg only to reply by another question, viz. How does the Rev. Editor justify the idea, that one who was in the human shape, possessed of human feelings, and subject to the calls of nature, was the very God whom he defines as existing forever, immaterial, invisible, and above all mortal causes or effects?

The Rev. Editor says, that "nothing can be more incorrect than my assertion, page 168, that Jesus in John x. 'disavowed the charge of making

Digitized by Google

himself God';—after having borne the fullest testimony to his equality with God, in chapters v. and viii., at length prevaricates and retracts for fear of death." I therefore refer to chapters v. and viii. and now ask the Editor whether he calls the following sayings of Jesus, found in chapters v. and viii. the fullest testimonies to his equality with God? "The Son can do nothing of himself." "For the Father loveth the Son, and *sheweth him* all things that himself doeth." "So the Son quickeneth whom he will; for the Father judgeth no man, but hath *committed* all judgment unto the Son." "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that *sent me*, hath everlasting life." "So hath he *given to the Son* to have life in himself, and hath given him authority," &c. "I can of *mine* ownself do nothing." "I seek not *mine own will*, but the will of the Father who hath *sent me*." "For the works which the Father hath *given me* to finish," &c. "I am come in *my Father's name*." Ch. viii.: "But he that sent me *is true*." "I do *nothing of myself*, but as my Father hath taught me I speak these things." "But now ye seek to kill me, *a man* that hath told you the truth which I have *heard of God*." "Neither came I myself, but *he sent me*." "I seek not mine own glory." "I know him (God) and keep *his saying*."* Do these testimonies amount to the equality of Jesus with his God and Father? If so, the Editor must have in view a definition of the term "equality" quite different from that maintained by the world.

* As to John v. 23, I beg to refer my readers to the subsequent chapter of this Essay, where I will examine the same verse fully.

I at the same time entreat the Editor to point out a single verse, in either of these two chapters, containing a proof of the equality of Jesus Christ with God, setting in defiance all the phrases I have now quoted from these very chapters. After reflecting upon the above-cited phrases, the Editor will, I hope spare the charge, that Jesus "at length prevaricates and retracts for fear of death;" for his disavowal of deity in ch. x. 36, was quite consistent with all the doctrines and precepts that he taught in the evangelical writings. (Vide the whole of the four Gospels.)

The Editor then adds, that "the confession, (in x. 34—36,) which our author terms a disavowal of deity, was the very confession for which they sought again to take him, because they still thought he made himself God." I am, therefore, under the necessity of quoting the context, to shew that the Jews seemed appeased at the explanation given by Jesus himself, as to their misunderstanding of him, and that they sought again to take him on account of another subsequent assertion of his. The context is, (32—39,) "Many good works have I shewed you from my Father; for which of those works do ye stone me? The Jews answered him, saying, For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy, and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God. Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said ye are gods? If he called them gods unto whom the word of God came, (and the scripture cannot be broken,) say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, thou blas-

Digitized by Google

phemest, because I said I am the Son of God? If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not: but if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works; that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me,* and I in him. *Therefore* they sought again to take him, but he escaped out of their hand." Does not Jesus here appeal to scripture, on the ground that if the sacred writings, every assertion of which is but true, are justified in calling magistrates and prophets gods, and that the Jews in reading the scriptures styled those superiors by the epithet gods, in conformity to their scriptures, they could not in justice accuse him, the sanctified Messiah of God, of blasphemy, for his having called himself only the Son of God? Does not Jesus here justify the use of the phrase "Son of God," for himself, in the same metaphorical sense that the term "gods" was used for the magistrates and prophets among Israel? If so, he of course relinquishes his claim to the use of the phrase "God," and "Son of God" in its real sense. If a commoner, who holds a high situation under government, suffers himself to be called "honorable," and, consequently, be accused of presumption in permitting himself to be designated by that title, on the ground that he was not actually the son of a nobleman, would he not justify himself against this charge by saying, "You call all the judges Lords in their judicial capacity, though they are not noblemen by birth; yet you charge me (who hold a more dignified situation than the judges)

* I have already in a preceding page (223) stated, that such a phrase as "one is in another, and the other is in him," implies in scriptural language only unity in design and will, as it is frequently applied to the apostles in reference to God, and to their Lord and Master Jesus Christ.

Digitized by Google

with arrogance, because I suffer myself to be addressed as 'honorable'—a title which the children of noblemen enjoy"? In following the example of Jesus, I now appeal to scripture, and also to common sense, that my readers may judge thereby whether verses 34—36 contain a confession of godhead, or a disavowal of deity, made by Jesus himself.

It is not only a single instance, in which Jesus omitted to correct the Jews in their misconceiving the phrase, "The Father is in me, and I in him," (verse 38,) but in many other instances he left them in ignorance. (John ii. 19, 21.) When Jesus told the Jews to destroy the temple, that he might raise it again in three days, they misunderstood him, and supposed that he intended to raise the temple of Jerusalem, and found fault with him, from this misconceived notion, before the high-priest. John ii. 21: "But he spoke of the temple of his body;" as well as John vii. 34—36, viii. 21, 22, as I noticed before in pages 85, 203. The Editor, lastly, says, that "Jesus at last chose to die under this very charge, rather than clear up the mistake, if it was such. This was their last and grand charge: 'We have a law, and by that law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God,' which they esteemed blasphemy worthy of death." The Editor must be well aware that the Jews had such an inveterate enmity against Jesus, that they not only charged him with what they found in him contrary to their law, but even with wilful exaggerations. John v. 15: "The man departed and told the Jews, that it was

Digitized by Google

Jesus who had made him whole." Ver. 16: "And therefore did the Jews persecute him, (Jesus,) and sought to slay him, because he had done these things on the sabbath day." (To perform a cure on the sabbath day, is supposed by the Jews to be a breach of the traditions of the elders, and not a crime worthy of death; yet they sought to kill Jesus under that pretence.) Ver. 17: "But Jesus answered them, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work. Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God." Although the Jews, in their own defence, called God their Father, without subjecting themselves to the charge of blasphemy; (John viii. 41, "*We have one Father* even *God*,") yet they sought to kill Jesus on the false ground, that he equalized himself with God by calling God his Father. It is worth observing, that, lest the Jews should infer his independence in doing miracles, and wrest his words from the purpose, ("My Father worketh hitherto, and I work,") Jesus firmly avows his entire dependence on God in whatever he had performed, in verse 19, ("Verily, I say unto you, the Son CAN do *nothing* [of] himself," &c.) and also in the following verses, insomuch that the Jews, being unable to find any plea for his destruction, remained quiet, and left Jesus in peace. (Vide the whole of ch. v.) In Luke xxiii. 2, the Jews charged him with having perverted the nation by representing himself as their king, and having forbidden to give tribute to Cæsar —a charge which was full of misrepresentation.

Digitized by Google

Let us return now to the text quoted by the Rev. Editor : "We have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the *Son of God ;*" whence it is evident, that, notwithstanding the great hatred which the Jews entertained towards our Saviour, and the misrepresentation they were guilty of in their accusation against him, the severest charge which they preferred under the presence of religion, was, that "he made himself the Son of God," and they would have, of course, accused him of having made himself God, to Pilate, whom they found inclined to release Jesus, and in presence of the multitude, this being better calculated to excite the wrath of the latter and horror of the former, had the Jews ever heard him declare himself God, or say any thing that amounted to his claim to the godhead. The high-priest and other chief accusers knew very well that their people were taught to consider God as their Father, and to call themselves the children of the Most High (correctly speaking, the *sons* of the Most High, Psalm lxxxii. 6); and this idea was so familiar among them, that Jesus also admitted them to be the particular children of the Deity. Mark vii. 27: "But Jesus said unto her, Let the children first be filled," &c.

The Editor says, (page 597,) that "our author queries on what principle any stress can be laid on the prophetic expression quoted in Heb. i. from the Psalms, 'Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever,' We reply merely on this principle, that it is spoken by God, who cannot lie." Are not these words also, "Ye are Gods," spoken by Him who cannot

Digitized by Google

lie? Is not the very verse of Hebrews, "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever," applied originally to Solomon by Him who cannot lie, and, in an accommodated sense, to Jesus by the apostle? I will not introduce the subject again, it having been noticed in page 99. The Editor expresses his astonishment at what I say in the Second Appeal, that the phrase "forever" must mean a limited time when referred to an earthly king or a creature, and therefore it carries no weight in the proof of the deity of Jesus, when applied to him. The reason which he assigns for his surprise is, How could I take this phrase in a finite sense when applied to Jesus, the eternal Jehovah? Did not the Editor feel astonished at the idea that he employs the application of the phrase "forever" in his attempt to prove the deity of Jesus, and then employs the circumstance of the eternal deity of Jesus' for the purpose of proving that infinite duration is understood by the phrase "forever,'' when referred to Jesus?

As he admits that "forever," when referred to a creature, implies a limited time only; he therefore, must spare this phrase, and try to quote some other term peculiar to God, in his endeavor to establish the deity of Jesus.

The Editor says, that the expression of Jesus to Mary, (John xx. 17,) "Go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God," was merely in his human nature. I wish the Editor had furnished us with a list, enumerating those expressions that Jesus Christ made in his human capacity, and anoth-

Digitized by Google

er shewing such declarations as he made in his divine nature, with authorities for the distinction. I might have, in that case, attentively examined them, as well as their authorities. From his general mode of reasoning, I am induced to think, that he will sometimes be obliged, in explaining a single sentence in the scriptures, to ascribe a part of it to Jesus as a man, and another part to him in his divine nature. As for example, John v. 22, 23: "For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son, that all men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father. He that honoreth not the Son, honoreth not the Father who [hath] sent me [him]". The first part of this sentence, "hath committed all judgement unto the Son," must have been (according to the Editor) spoken in the human nature of Jesus Christ, since the Almighty, in exercising his power, does not stand in need of another's vesting him with that power. The second part of the same sentence, "all men should *honor* the Son, [even] as they *honor* the Father," must be ascribed by the Editor to Jesus as God, he having been worthy to be honored as the Father is. And the last part, "who hath sent me, [him,]" relates again to Christ's human capacity, since it implies his subjection to the disposal of another. Is this the *internal* evidence of Christianity on which the orthodox divines lay stress? Surely not.

As to the exclamation of Thomas, (John xx. 28,) "My Lord and my God!" It is neither a confession of the supreme deity of Jesus by him, nor is it a vain exclamation, since it is evident, from verse 25,

Digitized by Google

that Thomas doubted Christ's resurrection without any reference to his deity; and that, when he saw Jesus and the print of the nails, he believed it, and being struck with such a circumstance, made the exclamation, "My Lord and my God!" according to the invariable habits of the Jews, Arabs, and almost all other Asiatic nations, who, when struck with wonder, often make exclamations in the name of the Deity; and that Jesus, from these apparent circumstances, and having perceived his heart, says, "because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed," (verse 29); by which Jesus acknowledges the belief of Thomas in the fact which he doubted in verse 25, that is, his resurrection; for thes ubject in question, as it stands in the context, has no allusion to the deity of Jesus; and the form in which a confession is made, is totally different from that of exclamation, both in the scriptures and in ordinary language. How can Thomas be supposed to have meant to confess the deity of Jesus in a mere exclamation, "My Lord and my God!" without adding some phrase conveying confession, such as "Thou art" my Lord and my God, and "I believe you to be" my Lord and my God? I beg that my readers will attentively refer to the context, and to the common habits of Asiatics on occasions similar to this, and form their opinion respecting this subject. The Editor quotes Matt. v. 37, which, with its context, forbid all sorts of swearing; but what relation this has to the exclamation of Thomas, in John xx. 28, I am unable to discover.

The Editor quotes six passages from the Gospel and the book of the Revelation, four of which I

Digitized by Google

have already examined, and I notice now the remaining two verses. First, John i. 1: "In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God." By the first sentence, ("in the beginning was the word,") the Editor attempts to prove the eternity of the Son; by the second, ("the word was with God,") his distinct personality; and by the third, ("the word was God,") his deity.

Let us first take this verse in it's literal sense, and ascertain whether or not it is, in that case, intelligible. "In the beginning"—i. e. in the first time—"was the word"—i. e. existed such a sound as was capable of conveying a meaning. "The word was with God"—i. e. this sound existed in the Deity, since no sound can exist of itself. "The word was God"—i. e. the word was the deity, or a deity, or being like other attributes of the deity—it was divine. The whole verse thus stands: "From the beginning the word of God, or Revelation manifesting his will and commandments, existed with him as God himself;" and by the same word God made or established all things; as the Jewish and Mohummudan, as well as Hindoo, theologians believe, on the authority of the works respectively acknowledged by them, that God made and established all things by his word only. (Vide Gen. i. 3, et seq.) And he communicated that Revelation to the world through Jesus Christ, (as testified beforehand by John the Baptist,) for the purpose of effecting the salvation of those that received and believed the authority of that Revelation,

Digitized by Google

This is detailed throughout verses 2—12.* In verses 13, 14, John expressly personifies "the word" in Jesus, as the bearer and deliverer of that Revelation: "The word was made flesh," (or the word was flesh,) "and dwelt among us," &c. To explain fully this metaphorical representation, John designates Jesus by this name, with the additional words "of life," once in his Epistle, 1 John i. 1, "The word of life," and with the additional words "of God," once in Rev. xix. 13, "His name is called The Word of God;" whereby he manifests that Jesus, as the deliverer of the word of God, is called by that name, and not actually identified with the word, as otherwise might have been supposed from his Gospel, i. 1. John i. 1, is not the only instance in which an attribute of the Deity is thus represented as one with God; for the very same writer identifies love with the Deity, in John iv. 8, 16, on the ground that love is of God, and is manifested in the world by him, 1 John iv. 7.

Secondly, I have to notice the orthodox exposition of the verse in question: they interpret the word "beginning," as signifying all eternity, and by the term "word," they understand Jesus the Son of God; that is, from all eternity the Son of God existed with God distinct in person, and he was also God. The interpretation is, I presume, equally unscriptural as it is revolting to the understanding, and for several reasons: First, as long as a passage can be consistently taken and understood in its

* The reason for the use of the masculine gender in these verses, both in the original Gospel and in the English version, is obvious, as the original word λογος, signifying the "word," is masculine.

Digitized by Google

literal sense, there can be no apology for taking it in a figurative one. Here we find no authority for identifying Jesus with the "word," or designating him by that term in any of the preceding gospels; he is only figuratively so called in Rev. by the name of "the word of God." Under these circumstances, to understand Jesus literally and so abruptly, by the term "word," in John i. 1, (against the established doctrine of the Jews and the rest of the oriental nations,) and to assume this word as existent in the beginning, and as instrumental in the hands of God, in moral and physical creations, is entirely inadmissable. 2dly, The Evangelist John, in his Gospel, uses the word "beginning" in a finite sense, and generally implying the beginning of the Christian dispensation, John xvi. 4, xv. 27, viii. 25, 44, vi. 64, ii. 11, and not once for "all eternity." Hence, to understand the word "beginning" in an infinite sense, is opposed to the sense adopted throughout the whole of his Gospel. 3dly, In the first verse of Genesis, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," we find, in a similar connexion, the same phrase, "in the beginning." Were we to follow the orthodox interpretation, and take it in an infinite sense, (i. e. from eternity God created the earth and heavens,) we should be compelled to profess the eternity of the world and become materialists. 4thly, To acknowledge the Son to be the true God, and to have lived with the true God from eternity, destroys at once the idea of the unity of God, and proves, beyond every question, the plurality of the Deity. For, if we see one real man living with another real man,

Digitized by Google

though both of them are one in nature and design, are we not compelled, by the ordinary course of nature, to apprehend the duality of man, and to say that there are two men? Can orthodox ingenuity prove, that there are not two, but one man, or prevent the comprehension of the duality of man? If not, I wish to know whether, after admitting that the real God, the Son, exists with the real God, the Father, from eternity, the Editor can consistently deny the existence of two real Gods? 5thly, The exposition of the Editor must render John i. 1, directly contradictory of Deut. xxxii. 39, "I am he, and there is *no God with me*." Here Jehovah himself expressly denies having another real God with him in the universe, for he is often said to have had fictitious gods with him, and, therefore, Jehovah's denial, in this verse, must be referred and confined to real gods. Psalm lxxxii. 1: "God standeth in the congregation of the mighty, he judgeth among the gods." He then addressed himself to those nominal gods of Israel, among whom he stood, "I said, *ye are gods*," (in verse 6). But we firmly believe that John, an inspired writer, could not utter any thing that might contradict the express declaration of Jehovah, though the Editor and others, from a mistaken notion, ascribe this contradiction to the Evangelist. 6thly, They thus render the last sentence of the verse, "the word was God," without the indefinite article "a" before "God," while they translate Exod. vii. 1, "I have made thee (Moses) a god to Pharoah," though in the original Hebrew, there stands only the word אלהים or "God," without

Digitized by Google

the indefinite article "a" before it. If regard for the divine unity induced them to add the article "a" in the verse of Exodus, "*a* God to Pharoah," why did not the same regard, as well as a desire of consistency, suggest to them to add the article "a" in John i. 1, "the word was a God"? We may, however, easily account for this inconsistency. The term "God," in Exodus, is applied to Moses, the notion of whose deity they abhor; but as they meant to refer the same term, in John i. 1, to Jesus, (whose deity they are induced by their education to support,) they leave the word "God" here, without the article "a," and carefully write it with a capital G. Lastly, If eternity be understood by the phrase "In the beginning," in John i. 1, and Jesus Christ be literally understood by the "WORD," then we shall not only be compelled to receive Christ as an eternal being, but also his apostles; since Luke (chap. i. 2,) speaks of himself and his fellow-disciples, as "eyewitnesses and ministers of the word from the beginning."

Thirdly, I shall now quote the interpretation of this passage, by searchers after truth, who have been enabled to overcome their early-acquired prejudices. See Improved Version, for which the Christian world is indebted to its eminently-learned authors.

"*The Word.*] 'Jesus is so called because God revealed himself or his word by him.' Newcome. The same title is given to Christ, Luke i. 2. For the same reason he is called the Word of life, 1 John i. 1, which passage is so clear and useful a comment upon the proem to the gospel, that it may be proper

Digitized by Google

to cite the whole of it. 'That which was *from the beginning*, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have *looked upon*, and our hands have handled of *the Word of life;* for *the Life* was *manifested*, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and *show* unto you, that eternal *Life* which was *with the Father*, and was manifested unto us, that which we have seen and heard, declare we unto you. By a similar metonymy Christ is called the Life, the Light, the Way, the Truth, and the Resurrection. See Cappe's Dissert. Vol. 1. page 19."

"*In the beginning.*] Or, from the first, i. e. from the commencement of the gospel dispensation, or of the ministry of Christ. This is the usual sense of the word in the writings of this evangelist. John vi. 64, Jesus knew from the beginning, or from the first; ch. xv. 27, 'Ye have been with me from the beginning.' See ch. xvi. 14, ii. 24, iii. 11; also 1 John i. 1, ii. 7, 8; 2 John 6, 7. Nor is this sense of the word uncommon in other passages of the New Testament. 2 Thess. ii. 13; Phil. iv. 15; Luke i. 2."

"*The Word was with God.*] He withdrew from the world to commune with God, and to receive divine instructions and qualifications, previously to his public ministry. As Moses was with God in the mount, Exod. xxxiv. 28, so was Christ in the wilderness, or elsewhere, to be instructed and disciplined for his high and important office. See Cappe, ibid. p. 22."

"*And the Word was a God.*] 'Was God.' Newcome. Jesus received a commission as a prophet of of the Most High, and was invested with extraor-

Digitized by Google

dinary miraculous powers. But in the Jewish phraseology they were called gods, to whom the word of God came. (John x. 35.) So Moses is declared to be a god to Pharoah. (Exod. vii. 1.) Some translate the passage, God was the Word, q. d. it was not so properly he that spake to men as God that spake to them by him. Cappe, ibid. See John x. 30, compared with xvii. 8, ii. 16, iii. 34, v. 23, xii. 44. Crellius conjectured that the true reading was θεου, the Word was God's, q. d. the first teacher of the gospel derived his commission from God. But this conjecture, however plausible, rests upon no authority."

"*Was in the beginning with God.*] Before he entered upon his ministry he was fully instructed, by intercourse with God, in the nature and extent of his commission."

"*All things were done by him.*] 'All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made.' Newcome; who explains it of the creation of the visible, material world by Christ, as the agent and instrument of God. See his notes on ver. 3 and 10. But this is a sense which the word εγενετο will not admit. Γινομαι occurs upwards of seven hundred times in the New Testament, but never in the sense of *create*. It signifies, in this gospel, where it occurs fifty-three times, to be, to come, to become, to come to pass; also, to be done or transacted, ch. xv. 7, xix. 36. It has the latter sense, Matt. v. 18, vi. 8, xxi. 42, xxvi. 6. All things in the Christian dispensation were done by Christ, i. e. by his authority, and according to his di-

Digitized by Google

rection; and in the ministry committed to his apostles nothing has been done without his warrant. See John xv. 4, 5, ' Without me ye can do nothing.' Compare vers. 7, 10, 16; John xvii. 8; Col. i. 16, 17. Cappe, ibid."

Verse 14: "Nevertheless, the Word was flesh." "' Though this first preacher of the gospel was honored with such signal tokens of divine confidence and favor, though he was invested with so high an office, he was, nevertheless, a *mortal man.*' Cappe. In this sense the word flesh is used in the preceding verse. '*Flesh,*' says Mr. Lindsey, *Sequel to the Apology*, page 136, 'is frequently put for *man.*'—Psalm lxv. 2; Rom. iii. 20. But it frequently and peculiarly stands for man as mortal, subject to infirmities and sufferings; and as such, is particularly appropriated to Christ here, and in other places. 1 Tim. iii. 16; Rom. i. 3, ix. 5; 1 Pet. iii. 18, iv. 1. Ὁ λογος σαρξ εγενετο, the Word *was* flesh, not *became* flesh, which is Newcome's translation, or, was *made* flesh, which is the common version. The most usual meaning of γινομαι, is *to be*. In this sense εγενετο is used in this chapter, ver. 6; also in Luke xxiv 19. The things concerning Jesus of Nazareth, ὁς εγενετο, who *was*, not who became a prophet. See Cappe, p. 86; and Socinus in loc."

Now my readers may judge which of these interpretations of John i. 1, is consistent with scriptural authority and conformable to the human understanding.

The Editor denies, positively, the charge of admitting three Gods, though he is in the practice of

worshiping God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. I could wish to know what he would say, when a Hindoo also would deny Polytheism on the same principle, that if three separate persons be admitted to make one God, and those that adore them be esteemed as worshippers of one God, what objection could be advanced, justly, to the oneness of three hundred and thirty-three million of persons in the Deity, and to their worship in different emblems? For, oneness of three or of thirty millions of separate persons is equally impossible, according to human experience, and equally supportable by mystery alone.

The second passage of John, quoted by the Editor, which I have not yet noticed, is John xvi. 30, "Now are we sure that thou knowest all things." I admit that Jesus knows all things concerning his ministry and the execution of final judgment, but not those that bear no relation to either of them, as I noticed in pages 99, 162, and 181, since the phrase "all things," is very often used in a definite sense, both in the Old and New Testaments. In Joshua i. 17, when the people said, "We hearkened to Moses in all things," they meant, of course, things with regard to the divine commandments. So, in Matt. xvii. 11, Elias is said to have "restored all things," that is, all things concerning his office as the forerunner of the Messiah. In Mark xiii. 23, Jesus said to his disciples, "I have foretold you all things," of course what respected their salvation. Eph. vi. 21: "Tychicus, a beloved brother, and faithful minister in the Lord, shall make known to

Digitized by Google

you all things," of course belonging to their salvation. Besides, the scriptures inform us, that those who devote themselves to the contemplation of the Deity are endued with the free gift of knowing all things; but from this circumstance they are not considered to be elevated to the nature of God, nor numbered as persons of the Godhead. Prov. xxviii. 5: "They that seek the Lord, understand *all things*." 2 Tim. ii. 7: "And the Lord give thee understanding *in all things*." 2 Sam. xiv. 20: "And my Lord is wise, according to the wisdom of an angel of God, to know *all things* that are in the earth."

The Editor quotes Paul, (page 598,) "God our Saviour," and 1 Peter, "The righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ," and also Jude, [25,] "To the only wise God our Saviour." He intends, perhaps, to shew, that as both God and Jesus are styled "Saviours," consequently Jesus is God.—I have fully noticed that several others, beside Jesus, were, like him, appointed by God to save people from time to time, and named Saviours in the scriptures; but that the use of this appellation does not serve to prove the deity of any of them. Vide pages 56 and 59.

The Editor expresses his despite of Hindoo polytheism, triumphing in his own pure profession. I wonder how it could escape the notice of the Editor, that the doctrine of plurality in unity maintained by him, and that professed by Hindoos, stand on the same footing, since the Editor, as well as the Hindoos, firmly declares the unity of God, while at the same time both acknowledge the *plurality* of *persons*

Digitized by Google

under the same Godhead, although they differ from each other in the exact number. The following passage quoted by the Editor, "the gods who have not made the heavens and the earth, shall *perish from the earth*, and from under these heavens," is equally applicable to several of the divine persons of both parties.

In answer to the Editor's query, Where does the unity of mankind exist? I entreat to be allowed to ask the Editor, where the unity of the Godhead exists? If he says, that it is one divine nature that exists between the three sacred persons, I answer, that the unity of mankind is one human nature, and exists between so many individual persons.

In answer to his question, When were all mankind one even in design and will? I shall say that mankind has always been one, and shall be one even in will and design, in the glorious and prosperous reign of Christ; and that present difference in will and design, or in rank and situation among its persons, does not preclude them from unity of nature, as the Editor himself admits that "one equal in nature to another may yet be subordinate in office." Besides, we find that the will of God the Father was sometimes at variance with that of God the Son. Matt. xxvi. 39: "O my Father, if it be possible, *let* this cup *pass* from *me;* nevertheless, not as *I will*, but *as thou wilt*." Mark xiv. 36: "And he (Jesus) said, Abba Father, all things are possible unto *thee; take away* this cup from me; nevertheless, not what *I will*, but what thou wilt."

The Editor appeals to common sense, saying, that

Digitized by Google

"she sees around her every day," that one man "equal in nature to another is yet subordinate in office." She sees so indeed; but when she sees one man equal in nature to another, she reckons them *two* men, whether one is subordinate in office to the other or not. To this part of the evidence, I beg the Editor will pay some attention. It is indeed astonishing, that, in all his illustrations, the Editor brings the Godhead to a level with any genus, including various species under it, but feels offended if any one should observe this fact to him.

The Editor says, (page 601,) "Nor is it true that it was the constant practice of the Saviour to pray to the Father for the power of working miracles; for he never did them in his Father's name, as was the invariable practice of the ancient prophets." In reply to this, I only refer the Editor to John xi. 41, to Mark viii. 6, where we find Jesus had actually prayed to the Father in raising the dead, and breaking the bread; and especially to John xi. 42, in which Jesus, by saying "thou hearest me *always*," avows that, during the whole period of his executing the divine commission, God *heard* his supplications, though in several instances of performing miracles, he had not used verbally the name of God, in imitation of the practice of some of the ancient prophets. See 2 Kings v. 27, in which Elisha is said to have made Gehazi a leper, without verbal supplication to God; and in ch. ii. 10, Elijah bestowed on Elisha his power of performing miracles, without praying verbally to the Most High. As to the Editor's assertion, that "he never did them (miracles)

Digitized by Google

in his Father's name," I again refer him to John x. 25, "The works that I do *in my Father's name*, they bear witness of me." Ver. 43: "I am come in my *Father's name*, and ye receive me not; if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive." Here Jesus rests his divine commission on the name of God, and rejects the claims of any one who comes in his own name. He certainly sent his disciples to work miracles in his own name, as the Messiah *sent* from God, that his apostles might procure faith in him from Jews and Gentiles, whereby they both might have their access to God through him. Matt. x. 40—42: "He that receiveth you receiveth me; and he that receiveth *me* receiveth him *that sent me*. He that *receiveth* a prophet *in the* name of a prophet *shall receive* a prophet's reward; and he that receiveth a righteous man in the name of a righteous man, *shall receive* a righteous man's reward. And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only *in the name of a disciple*, verily I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward." These shew evidently that man should be rewarded for any act that he may perform in the name of a disciple, even in the name of a righteous man. How much more is he to be approved in the sight of God, if he acts in the name of the Messiah of the Most High!

I do not wonder at the idea of Christ's empowering his apostles to work miracles, when we find other prophets doing the same at their own choice, as I have often noticed. The Editor says, "If it be declared in scripture, that the Father created all things

Digitized by Google

by and for the Son, it proves only that the Son is equal to the Father," and that the passages, "'He hath given to the Son to have life in himself,' 'the first-born of every creature,' place the equality of the Son with the Father beyond all dispute." This must be a new mode of proof, invented for the support of the Trinity, founded on mystery, far beyond my understanding. For if a creature's being endowed with life by, or employed as an instrument in the hands of another, puts them both on a footing of equality, then, in the Editor's estimation, the clay is equal to the potter; the rod with which Moses performed his miracles was equal to that great prophet; and Moses himself, by whom, and for whom, God exhibited so many wonderful works, was equal to the Deity.

CHAPTER V.

Remarks on the Replies to the Arguments found in Chapter the Third of the Second Appeal.

The Editor now comes (page 602) "to the last, and by far the easiest part of his work," that of meeting my objections to the seven positions formerly advanced in support of the deity of Christ. The first of these is, that Jesus was possessed of ubiquity, deduced from John iii. 13, "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man, who is in heaven." The ubiquity of Jesus is by the Editor grounded on the phrase,

Digitized by Google

"who is in heaven," found in the present tense, while Jesus was at that time on earth. I in the first place observed in my Second Appeal, (p. 175,) that this argument might, perhaps, carry some weight with it, were not the frequent use of the present tense in a preterite or future sense observed in the sacred writings; and were not a great number of other passages to determine that the term "is" in this instance must be understood in the past tense; and to support this assertion, I quoted several passages, a few of which the Editor has discussed, leaving the rest quite unnoticed. One of these is John viii. 58: "Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am." To weaken its force, the Editor says, "why must this declaration, 'Before Abraham was, I am,' be taken in a preterite sense? Because if it be not, our author's case dies." No; but because it would bear no sense unless thus understood, "Before Abraham was, *I was*." The Editor further says, "Did the Jews, however, understand it thus? So far from it, that they esteemed it a decided declaration of Jesus's equality with the Father, and took up stones to stone him as a blasphemer." The Jews understood Jesus as declaring himself to be more ancient than Abraham, which they first inferred from his assertion "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it and was glad." (John viii. 56.) But there is nothing in the context that can convey the least idea of the Jews having esteemed the phrase "Before Abraham was, I am," a "decided declaration of Jesus's equality with the Father," or of their having, in conse-

Digitized by Google

quence, taken up stones to stone him. Nor can the circumstance of their attempt to stone Jesus, be considered as a proof of their viewing the above declaration respecting his priority to Abraham, as blasphemy against God, for they sought to slay Jesus once on account of his having healed a man on the sabbath day, which they considered as a breach of their law, and not as a claim to equality with the Deity; (John v. 16;) and they wanted again to destroy Jesus merely from his affirming, "I know him, for I am from him and *he hath sent me;* (John vii. 29, 30;) and finally from motives of political safety as far as regarded their connexion with the Romans, the Jews resolved to kill him. (John xi. 47, 48, 53.)

The Editor says, that "Jesus himself, meek and lowly as he was, although he knew precisely in what sense they understood him, rather chose to work a miracle for his own safety, than to deny his divinity." From what I have just stated, and from all that I mentioned in pp. 228, 203, it obviously appears, that neither the Jews understood his deity from the assertion, "before Abraham was I am," nor was it usual with Jesus to correct them whenever they mistook his meaning. The Editor might further perceive, in John v. 20, and its context, that Jesus, though charged with having a demon, omitted to correct fully their mistaken notion; and also, in John viii. 48 and 49, that, on the Jews reproaching him with being a Samaritan, and with being possessed by a demon, the Saviour only denied the second, and omitted to notice the former, which was the grossest charge that one Jew could ever prefer against another.

Digitized by Google

The Editor seems doubtful as to the force of the arguments he has adduced in turning the above verse to his purpose, as he thought it proper to have recourse to "the body of evidence previously adduced" in his attempt to prove "Christ's ubiquity;" but my readers may be able to judge, from a calm examination of this body of evidence, whether or not it has any weight in proof of the ubiquity of the Son.

The Editor now lays down a rule for those instances where the present tense is used in the scriptures for the past, saying, "In poetry, and sometimes in lively narrative, the present is, with strict propriety, used for the past, because the transaction is narrated as though passing before the reader's eyes." I therefore beg the Editor to explain, conformably to this rule, the instances I noticed, (Second Appeal, pp. 175, 176,) and numerous other instances. John xi. 8: "His disciples *say* unto him," instead of *said* unto him. Ver. 38: "Jesus *cometh* to the grave," that is, *came* to the grave. Ch. xiii. 6: "Then *cometh* he to Simon Peter," that is, he *came* to Simon Peter. Do these come under the denomination of poetry or lively narration? If not, the Editor's rule must fall to the ground. If the Editor insists upon their being lively narration, because the circumstances are "narrated as though passing before the reader's eyes," how can we be prevented, in that case, from taking the assertion in John iii. 11, also for a lively narration, on the same ground, that the circumstances are narrated in the verse in question "as though passing before the reader's eyes," although Jesus had in reality meant by present, the past tense?

Digitized by Google

The Editor further observes, that "it is a didactic discourse, on the clearness and accuracy of which depended the salvation of a man (Nicodemus) who had hazarded much in coming to Jesus for instruction." It is true that Jesus, as the greatest prophet of God, (or an omniscient being, according to the orthodox creed,) though well aware of the slow apprehension of Nicodemus, instructed him in a language far from being clear and comprehensible to him, both in the preceding and following verses. Vide ver. 3: "Except a man *be born again*, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Ver. 8: "So is every one that is *born of the Spirit.*" Ver. 13: "No man hath *ascended up to heaven* but he that came down from heaven," &c. Ver. 14: "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man *be lifted up*"—foretelling him of his death on the cross by these ambiguous words. Nay, moreover, he, in his discourse with the Jews and the multitude, very often expressed his ideas in such a manner, that not only the Jews, but his own disciples, mistook his meaning; but he always regulated his instructions as he was guided by his and our heavenly Father. It would be, therefore, presumptuous in us to lay down rules for his conduct, maintaining that "common humanity, therefore, demanded that in further discourse with him, no word should be used but in it's *direct and proper sense.*"

In answer to his assertion, "If then, he would only tell us, how Jesus was regarded in those realms of light and truth previously to his descent on earth, he would himself settle this point,"—I beg to refer the

Digitized by Google

Editor to such authority as no Christian can ever deny; I mean 1 Peter i. 20: "Who verily was *foreordained before the foundation of the world*, but was *manifested* in these last times for you." And also to 2 Tim. i. 9: "Who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which *was given us* in Christ Jesus *before the world began*." If this plain explanation fall short of convincing the Editor of the real sense in which the pre-existence of Jesus and of his followers was meant, my endeavor to correct his notion on this head must be of no use.

In order to weaken the force of the argument I founded on John vi. 62, "The Son of Man ascend up where he *was before*," shewing the absence of Jesus from heaven, while he was talking to men on earth, the Editor quotes Gen. xi. 5, xviii. 33, xxxv. 13, in which Jehovah is stated to have moved from one place to another, though possessed of omnipresence. But the Editor overlooked, or thought it judicious to omit to notice, the real point of my argument in the Second Appeal, which I now repeat: "For the attribute of omnipresence is quite inconsistent with the human notions of the ascent and descent effected by the *Son of Man*." It is not impossible for the omnipresent God that he should manifest himself wherever he chooses without violating his omnipresence; but the notion of occupying two very distant places at one time by a *son of man*, is, of course, contrary to the ideas acquired by human experience, unless this extraordinary circumstance be

Digitized by Google

ascribed to the power of performing miracles bestowed on man by God.

Jesus, however, took every precaution in wording his discourse with Nicodemus, by the use of the term *man* in the very same verse, (13,) thus establishing his humanity; but, notwithstanding this, the prejudices of a great number of his followers have induced them to infer his ubiquity, and thereby his deity from the same verse.

I will not recur to the examination of such passages as "who made all things," "who upholds all things," &c. alluded to here by the Editor, having often noticed them in the former part of this work.

Let us now come to the real point, and ascertain whether or not the word, in the original Greek, which is rendered "is" in the English version, in the phrase "who is in heaven," actually signifies the present tense, as a candid inquiry into this very point will bring us to a satisfactory decision at once. The word in the original is ων, a participle, and not a verb; and all that I said in my Second Appeal may be compressed into three remarks. In the first place, that the time of the participle is referred to the time of the verb found in the sentence; and to corroborate this opinion, I quoted Bishop Middleton's doctrine of the Greek Article, Part i. p. 42, Note: "We are to refer the time of the participle to the time of the act, &c. implied in the verb; for, past, present and future, cannot be meant otherwise than in respect of that act."* And I also cited John i. 48, Οντα ειδον σε, "I

* The Editor has given, in p. 607, a quotation from Bishop Middleton, with some remarks of his own; but I am perfectly willing to leave it to the discerning reader to judge whether it corroborates my opinion or makes against it.

Digitized by Google

saw thee when thou wast;" literally, "I saw thee being," in which the present participle implies the past in correspondence with the verb ειδον, or "I saw," found in the same verse. I now also beg the attention of the Editor to the common usage of almost all the languages that have the use of a present participle, in which he will find the participle generally referring to the time of the verb related to it. In English, for example, in the following phrase, "Being ill, I could not call upon you," the time of the present participle "being" refers, I presume, to the verb "could not call" implying the past tense.

In the second place, I quoted Levit. vii. 33, xiv. 47, in which the present participle is accompanied with the definite article, observing, that "these present participles are referred to a time present with respect to the act of the verbs connected with them, but future, with respect to the command of God"—that is, when the definite article is prefixed in Greek to a present participle, it has reference to the verb connected with it in an indefinite manner. So we find many instances in the New Testament similar to those quoted from Leviticus. In the third place, I said, "Moreover, we frequently find the present participle used in a past tense, even without reference to the time of the verb. John ix. 25: Τυφλος ων αρτι βλεπω, "Being blind, now I see;" that is, "Having been blind, now I see."

The Editor, omitting to notice the second and third arguments adduced by me, makes remarks only on the first, saying, that "were this criticism" ("be-

Digitized by Google

ing in heaven," instead of "is in heaven") perfectly correct, it would not be of the least service to our author, as, he being in heaven, is precisely the same as he who is in heaven."—I positively object to the accuracy of this assertion of the Editor; for the verb "is," generally affirms an act or a state at the time present when spoken; but the present participle ὢν, or "being," even when preceded by the definite article ὁ, or "the," implies time indefinitely, though the article ὁ is often rendered by a relative pronoun "who" or "which," and the participle by a verb, for the sake of elegance in English composition. I beg to refer the Editor first to those texts quoted in my Second Appeal. Levit. vii. 33: Ο προσφερων—αυτω εσται ὁ βραχιων ὁ δεξιος, "The offering (person) for him shall be the right shoulder." Although the participle "offering" is found here in the present tense, yet it indisputably implies, that at any time in future in which the offering may be made, "the offerer shall be entitled to the right shoulder." Lev. xiv. 47: Ο εσθων—πλυνει τα ιματια αυτου, "The eating (person) shall wash his clothes." The word "eating," though found here in the present participle, preceded by the definite Greek article ὁ, signifies any part of the future in which the act of eating shall take place. The phrase, "*the eating*," (person,) is rendered in the English version, "he that eateth," conformably to the idiom of the English language; but this change of construction does not produce any change in the real meaning conveyed by the original Greek. As this phrase, "he that eats," bears no allusion to the support of the doctrine of the Trinity,

Digitized by Google

no one will, I presume, scruple to interpret it in its original sense; that is, he who eats at any time future with respect to the commandment of God, shall wash his clothes.

Secondly, I refer the Editor to the passages he quoted in p. 608, to save me the trouble of selecting them. John iii. 4: "How can a man be born when he is old?" literally, "being old;" that is, at any point of time, no man being old can be born. Ver. 15: "That no man believing on him should perish;" that is, no one who may be induced to believe Jesus at any time, even up to the last day, should perish. Ver. 18: "He not believing is condemned already;" that is, he who rejects me at any time, is condemned already in the divine decree. Ver. 20: "Every one doing evil hateth light," at any time whatsoever. Ver. 29: "He having the bride is the bridegroom," at any period of time. Ver. 31: "He being of the earth is earthly," at any period of time. Again, ch. v. 3: "In these lay a great multitude of folk impotent," &c. In the original Greek, the verb "to lie," is in the imperfect tense, and consequently the participle may be thus rendered, "Who were impotent up to that time." Ver. 5: "And a certain man was there who had an infirmity thirty and eight years." In this verse the participle is not preceded by the article: this, however, signifies that a certain man had an infirmity when he was present at the pool—not at the time when St. John narrated this circumstance. But with a view to expose my argument to ridicule, the Editor puts his own words into my mouth, saying, (p. 608,) "In this Chapter v. 4, we have, 'how

Digitized by Google

can a man be born when he is old ?' literally, 'being old,' on our author's plan, 'having been old, and now not being so;'" and so on in all the above-stated verses. But I wonder how he could mistake what I have advanced in my Second Appeal, in explanation of a present participle preceded by the article ὁ in the following words: "The offering (person) for him shall be the right shoulder:—the eating (person) shall wash his clothes. These present participles are referred to a time present with respect to the act of the verbs connected with them, but future with respect to the command of God." Now my reader may judge whether I confined the meaning of a present participle to the past tense, as the Editor, no doubt inadvertently, misrepresents my arguments.

Thirdly, I beg to refer the Editor to the translation of that verse by the celebrated Dr. Campbell: "For none ascendeth into heaven, but he who descended from heaven, the Son of Man, whose abode is in heaven;" in which the sense of the participle is referred to an indefinite time; for a person whose abode is in London, may have his temporary residence in Paris.

Fourthly, I beg also to refer to the explanation of the article ὁ before a participle, given by Parkhurst; "xi. With a participle it may generally be rendered by *who*, *that*, *which*, and the participle as a verb. Thus 1 John ii. 4, ὁ λεγων, he who saith, i. e. the (person) saying. John i. 18, ὁ ων *who is* or *was*."

As to the assertion of the Editor, that were the time of the participle "being," found in the phrase "being in heaven," referred to the verb "to ascend

Digitized by Google

up to heaven," it would completely prove the ubiquity of Christ, or involve perfect absurdity; I presume there would be neither of these difficulties, in the event of the participle being referred to the verb mentioned in the verse; for, one's being in heaven, or having his abode in heaven, does not render his ascent to heaven impossible, nor does it tend to prove his deity. Let us apply these circumstances as they stand literally to Moses and Elias, who descended from their heavenly abode, and appeared with Jesus Christ to his apostles, (Matt. xvii. 3,) and again ascended, would it prove their ubiquity, or involve absurdity? But is there any thing more absurd than an attempt to prove the ubiquity of a son of man capable of occupying only a certain small space on earth?

In reply to his assertion, that "when John wishes to describe a past state of action or being, he chooses some past participle," I only beg to remind him, that in the Greek language there is no past or future participle for the verb εἰμι, *to be*, and, consequently, the present participle is used for those tenses under the specific rules.*

* The true explanation of the verse is given in the IMPROVED VERSION, as follows: "Now no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he who came down from heaven, † even the Son of Man, [who is in heaven.]"‡

† "*He who came down from heaven.*] This clause is correlative to the preceding. If the former is to be understood of a local ascent, the latter must be interpreted of a local descent. But if the former clause is to be understood figuratively, as Raphelius and Doddridge explain it, the latter ought in all reason to be interpreted figuratively likewise. If 'to ascend into heaven,' signifies to become acquainted with the truths of God, 'descend from heaven,' is to bring down, and to discover those truths to the world. And this text clearly explains the meaning of the phrase, wherever it occurs in this evangelist. 'Coming down from heaven,' means coming from God, (see ver. 2,) as Nicodemus expressed it, who did not understand this of a local descent, but of a divine commission. So Christ interprets it ver. 17. Sn."

‡ "*Who is in heaven.*] This clause is wanting in some of the best

Digitized by Google

As to the second passage which he quoted to demonstrate the ubiquity of Jesus, (Matt. xviii. 20, "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them,") I observed in my Second Appeal, "Is it not evident that the Saviour meant here, by being in the midst of two or three of his disciples, his guidance of them when joined in searching for the truth, without preferring any claim to ubiquity? We find similar expressions of the scriptures wherein the guidance of the prophets of God is meant by words that would imply their presence. Luke xvi. 29: 'Abraham said unto him, They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them.' No one will suppose that this expression is intended to signify that the Jews actually had Moses and the prophets in person among them, or that they could hear them speak, in the literal sense of the words; nor can any one deduce the omnipresence of Moses and the prophets from such expressions."

The Editor, to avoid entering into the main argument, puts the following questions, to which I shall now reply. 1st. "If Christ guided them, must he not have been with them for that purpose?" Yes, he has been with them in the same manner as Moses and the prophets have been with the Israelites, as is evident from the above-quoted passage of Luke, as well as from another which I shall now cite. 1 John iii. 24: "And he that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him, and he in him: and hereby we know that he *abideth in us, by the spirit which he hath given us.*" 2dly. "If there were only two such

copies. If its authenticity is allowed, it is to be understood of the knowledge which Christ possessed of the Father's will. See John i. 18."

Digitized by Google

little companies searching for the *truth* at the same moment, must he not have possessed ubiquity to guide them both?" I reply by two other questions. If the Jews of Galilee and of Jerusalem "have Moses and the Prophets" at the same time for their guidance, are Moses and the Prophets to be supposed to have been possessed of ubiquity? After Elijah went up to heaven, (2 Kings ii. 11,) and his spirit was seen resting on Elisha, who remained on earth, (Ver. 15,) does the circumstance of *Elijah's* being in heaven, and being with his servant Elisha on earth in spirit at the same time, prove the ubiquity of Elijah? 3dly. The Editor asks, "If he (Jesus) was with Christians to guide them, has he left them now?" I reply, neither Jesus nor Moses and the Prophets have now forsaken those that sincerely search into truth, and are not fettered with early-acquired human opinions. 4th. "How then, can he be the same yesterday, to-day, and forever?" My reply is, he has been the same in like manner as David has been, in "keeping the law continually *forever and ever*." (Psalm cxix. 44.) 5th. "Does our author need to be told that this meant the writings of Moses and the Prophets?" I reply, that this expression means their words preserved forever by means of writing as the statutes of God. Psalm cxix. 152: "Concerning thy testimonies, I have known of old that thou hast founded them forever." Ver. 89: "Forever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven." And Deut. xxxii. 1, Moses exclaims, "Give ear, O ye heavens, and I will speak, and hear, O earth, the words of my mouth; my doctrine shall

Digitized by Google

drop as the rain, my speech shall distil as the dew," &c. 6th. "Did Jesus mean that they had his writings with them?" I reply, he meant, of course, that they had his lowly spirit, and his words, which were afterwards published and preserved in writing. 7th. "Where were the writings of Jesus at that time?" I said not a word of his writings in my Second Appeal. Why the Editor puts this question to me, I know not. It is, however, evident, that Jesus himself, while on earth, like other prophets of God, never omitted to express his doctrines and precepts, which have been handed down in writing up to this day.

SECOND POSITION.

The Editor quoted Matt. xi. 27, "No man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him,"to shew that Jesus ascribes to himself a knowledge and an incomprehensibility of nature equal to that of God. I consequently asked the Editor in my Second Appeal, "If he, by the term 'incomprehensible,' understands a total impossibility of being comprehended in any degree, or only the impossibility of attaining to a perfect knowledge of God?" If the former, we must be under the necessity of denying such a total incomprehensibility of the Godhead; for the very passage cited by the Editor declares God to be comprehensible not to the Son alone, but also to every one who should receive revelation from the Son; and in John xvi. 16, 17, Jesus ascribes to his disciples a knowledge of the

Digitized by Google

Holy Ghost, whom the Editor considers one of the persons of the Godhead, possessed of the same nature with God. But if the Editor understands by the passage he has quoted, the incomprehensibility of the real nature of the Godhead, I admit the position, but deny his inference that such an incomprehensibility proves the nature of the object to be *divine*, as being peculiar to God alone, for it appears evident that a knowledge of the real nature even of a common leaf, or a visible star, surpasses human comprehension. The Editor, although he filled one page (610) in examining that part of the reply, yet made no direct answer to the foregoing question, but repeats his inference from these passages, "that Jesus himself can comprehend the nature of the Father, and that his own nature is equally inscrutable;" but the verse in question does not convey one or other of these positions. As to the first, we find the latter part of the sentence ("neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him") declaring an exception to the general assertion made in the former part of it; ("neither knoweth any man the Father;") that is, the Son, and those to whom the Son reveals God, were the only individuals that knew the nature of the Father. Would not this exception be distinctly contrary both to the sacred authorities, and to common sense; as the scripture declares positively that the nature of God is incomprehensible to men? Job xxxvi. 26: "God is great, we know him not;" and common sense teaches us every moment, that if the real nature of the works of God is incomprehensible

Digitized by Google

to the human intellect, how much more must the nature of God himself be beyond human understanding! As to the second, if the circumstance of the Son's declaring himself (according to the Editor) to be inscrutable in nature, be acknowledged as equalizing him with God, similar declarations by his apostles would of course raise them to the same footing of equality with the Deity. 1 John iii. 1: "Therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not," corroborated by John xviii. 25, "O righteous Father, the world hath not known thee," &c. It is, therefore, evident, that neither can an impossibility of comprehending God, in any degree, be meant by this passage, the apostles having known God by revelation; nor can the comprehension of the real nature of God be understood by it, as such a knowledge is declared to be unattainable by mankind. The verse in question must be thus understood, as the meaning evidently is, "that no one but the Father can fully comprehend the object and extent of the Son's commission, and no one but the Son comprehends the counsels and designs of the Father with respect to the instruction and reformation of mankind. It is impossible that Jesus can be speaking here of the person and nature of the Father; for this he did not, and could not reveal, being essentially incomprehensible. Neither, therefore, does he mean the nature and person of the Son. What Christ knew and revealed 'was the Father's will;' corresponding to this, 'that which the Father, and the Father only, knew, was the nature and extent of the Son's commission.'" Improved Version.

Digitized by Google

THIRD POSITION.

As the Editor expressed his opinion that "Jesus exercised in an independent manner the prerogative of forgiving sin, which is peculiar to God," founding this opinion upon the authority of Mark ii. 5, Matt. ix. 2, "Thy sins be forgiven thee," I inquired in my Second Appeal, "Does not this passage, ('But when the multitude saw it, they marvelled, and glorified God who had given such power unto men,' Matt. ix. 8,) convey an express declaration that Jesus was as much dependent on God in exercising the power of forgiving sins, and healing the sick, as the other prophets who came forth from God before him?" To which the Editor replies, "We answer, only in the opinion of the multitude, who knew him not, but took him for a great prophet."

I feel surprised at the assertion of the Editor, that it was the ignorant multitude, who knew not the nature of Jesus, that made the following declaration, "who had given such power to men;" since it is the Holy Spirit which speaks by the mouth of the evangelist Matthew, saying, "when the *multitude* saw it, *they* marvelled, and *glorified* God, who had given such power unto men."

I wonder how the Editor could allow his zeal in support of the Trinity so far to bias his mind, that he has attempted to weaken the authority of the holy evangelist, by ascribing his words to the ignorant multitude of Jews. I wonder still more, to observe, that notwithstanding the Editor declares the apostles and primitive Christians, (whom he does not esteem as persons of the Godhead, but admits

Digitized by Google

to be mere men,) to have been possessed of the power of pardoning sins through the influence of Jesus; yet he maintains the opinion, that none, except God, can forgive sins even through the gift of the Deity himself.

The Editor says, "Not, however, in the opinion of the Scribes, who were better acquainted with their own scriptures, and who, although they glorified him not as God, could not restrain themselves from acknowledging the display of his Godhead by accusing him of blasphemy on that very account."

The Jews were so ill-disposed towards Jesus, that this is not the first instance in which they sought a pretence for destroying him under the charge of blasphemy; for in John v. 16, they resolve to slay him merely on pretence of his having healed a man on the sabbath day, as I noticed before; and, in chapter xii. 10, 11, they came to a determination, under the cloak of religion, to kill him and Lazarus also, whom Jesus raised after death, though they knew that many of their prophets raised the dead, without offending God or the people. And they also very frequently mistook his meaning. But Jesus often forbore to repel their charges, some instances of which I have already pointed out in page 203. As to Jesus's knowledge of the human heart, as far as it respects his divine commission and future judgment, and his power of performing miraculous deeds, even sometimes without verbal reference to God, having often noticed these matters in pp. 90 and 179, I shall not recur to them here.

The Editor denies the apostles having been im-

Digitized by Google

pressed with a belief, that it was the Almighty Father that empowered Jesus to forgive sins and to perform miracles. I therefore refer the Editor to the very phrase, "Who had given such power unto men," and to Acts v. 31, "Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins." xiii. 38, "Through this *man* (meaning the Saviour) is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins." Do not these verses shew, beyond a doubt, that Jesus received from God the power of forgiving sins on sincere repentance?

The Editor makes no direct answer to Luke xxiii. 34, in which Jesus prays to the Father for the pardon of the murder perpetrated by the Jews upon him, nor to Luke xi. 4, Matt. vi. 14, which I quoted in my Second Appeal, page 184. The Editor alludes to the importance of the expression, "That thy Son may glorify thee." But by referring to the scriptures, he will find, that similar terms are as common in the language of the Jews, in their address to God, as any other expressions of reverence for the Deity.

FOURTH POSITION.

With a view to substantiate his fourth position, that Almighty power is claimed by Jesus in the most unequivocal manner, the Editor thus comments on the passage, John v. 19—36, quoted by me in my Second Appeal: "Jesus, when persecuted by the Jews, for having healed a man on the sabbath day, said, 'My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.'

Digitized by Google

This provoked the Jews still more, because he had now said, that God was his Father, making himself equal with God." The Editor adds, "This observation shews us, that not only the Jews, but John himself, understood Christ's calling God his Father, to be making *himself God.*" It would have been a correct translation of the original Greek, if the Editor had said, "making himself equal with, or like God," instead of "making himself God," (vide the original Greek). It is obvious, that one's calling another his Father, gives apparent ground to understand that there is an equality of nature or likeness of properties between them, either in quantity or quality of power in performing works. But to know what kind of equality or likeness should be meant in Ch. v. 18; we have luckily before us the following texts, in which Jesus declares, that his likeness with God consisted in doing what he saw the Father do, and quickening the dead; avowing repeatedly, at the same time, his inferiority to and dependence on God, in so plain a manner, that the Jews who heard him, abstained from the measures of persecution that they had intended to adopt, although the Saviour continued to call God his Father, through the whole of the remaining chapter, in the hearing of the Jews. Nay, further, from the whole of his conduct and instructions, so impressed were the Jews with his dependence upon and confidence in the Father as his God, that when he was hanging on the cross they fixed upon this as a ground of taunt and reproach, saying, "He trusted in God; let him deliver him now, if he will have him, for he said, 'I am the Son of God.'" Matt. xxvii. 43.

Digitized by Google

The Editor then proceeds to say, "This (charge of equality) Jesus neither denies nor corrects, but adds, 'The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do,' which must necessarily be the case, if, as our author affirms, the Father and the Son are one in will and design." I ask the Editor, whether this be the language of one who is almighty? If the Father and the Son be equally almighty, why should the Son wait until the Father acts, and then imitate him? If a subordinate officer, having been accused of equalizing himself with his superior, thus declares, "I cannot march a single step myself, but where I see him march, I do march,"—would this be considered an avowal of his equality with his superior? My readers will be pleased to judge. The Editor then says, that "Jesus *adds* further, 'For whatever things he doth, these also doth the Son likewise;' a more full declaration of equality with the Father cannot be imagined. How could the Son do whatsoever the Father doth, if he were not equal to him in power, wisdom, truth, mercy?" &c. The Editor here omits to quote the very next line, "FOR the Father loveth *the Son*, and *sheweth* him all things that himself doth," in which the preposition "for" assigns reasons for the Son's doing what the Father doth; i. e. since the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him his works, the Son is enabled to do what he sees the Father do. To the Editor's query, "What finite being could understand all that God doth, if shewn him?" I reply, Divine wisdom will of course not show any thing to one whom it has not previously enabled to compre-

Digitized by Google

hend it. How could the following passages escape the memory of the Editor, when he put the question: Amos iii. 7, "Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but revealeth his secret unto his servants the Prophets;" Psalm xxv. 14, "The *secret* of the Lord is with them that fear him, and he will *shew them* his covenant?" Did not they understand all that was shewn and revealed unto them? If they did, were they, in consequence, all infinite beings, as the Editor argues, from this circumstance, Jesus is?

The Editor proceeds to say, "Jesus adds, 'For as the Father quickeneth the dead, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will.' Here, then, he declares himself equal with the Father in sovereignty of will, as well as in almighty power." The Editor again omits a part of the sentence which runs thus: "So the Son quickeneth whom he will; FOR the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son." Does not the latter part of the sentence shew clearly, that the power which the Son enjoyed, in quickening those whom he chose, was entirely owing to the commission given him by the Father? In order to weaken the force of verse 22, the Editor says, "The Father, however, whose it is equally with the Son, commits all judgment to the Son, as the incarnate mediator between God and man, because he is the Son of Man." My readers may observe, that if Jesus received all power of judging men in his human nature, he must have quickened whom he pleased, as the consequence of that power, in his human capacity; how, then, could the Editor infer the deity of Jesus from one circumstance,

Digitized by Google

(quickening the dead,) which entirely depends upon another, (the power of judging,) enjoyed by him in his human nature? Lest it should be supposed that individual instances of the dead being raised by Jesus is here meant, I may just mention that he exercised this power in common with other prophets.

As to his assertion, that the work of judging mankind belongs, by nature, equally to the Son and to the Father, I only refer the Editor to Matt. xix. 28, and Luke xxii. 29, 30, in which the apostles are represented as invested with the power of judging the Twelve Tribes of Israel, and to 1 Cor. vi. 2, which ascribes the power of judging the world to righteous men; and I hope that the Editor will be convinced, from these authorities, that the "work of judging mankind" does not "belong, by nature, to the Son and to the Father." He introduces, in the course of this argument, John viii. 58, and Rev. i. 8, which I have often examined in the preceding pages, 248, 123.

He at last comments on verse 23, "That all men should honor the Son as they honor the Father," saying, that, "to this glorious declaration of the Son's Godhead, our author merely objects, that this means likeness in nature and quality, and not in exact degree of honor. But what are the nature and quality of the honor paid to God the Father? divine honor of the highest kind, and such as can be given to no creature?" The phrases, "to honor God," and "to adore God," are used in quite different senses; the latter being peculiarly applicable to God, but the former generally implying only such

Digitized by Google

manifestation of reverence as one may bestow on his Father, or on another worthy of respect. Mal. i. 6: "A son honoreth his father, and a servant his master: if then I be *a Father*, where is mine honor?" &c. Here God requires the same kind of honor to be paid him as is due to a father. Does God here bring himself, in consequence, to a level with a parent? 1 Sam. ii. 30: "But now the Lord saith, Be it far from me; for them that honor me, I will honor."—Here the manifestation of honor between God and men, is reciprocal; but in any sense whatsoever, no worship can be reciprocally offered by God and his creatures. The Editor again advances, that "the fact is, that this phrase '*as*,' really refers to degree as well as to nature; see Matt. xx. 14: 'I will give unto this last even as unto thee,' that is, precisely as much as one penny." I deny the accuracy of this rule of the Editor, since "as," in almost all instances, refers either to degree or nature, or to some kind of resemblance, a few of which I shall here notice. Gal. iv. 14, Paul says to the Galatians, "But received me *as an angel of* God, even *as Christ Jesus*." Did Paul permit the Galatians to receive him with precisely the same kind of honor, both in kind and degree, as was due to Christ Jesus? Matt. x. 25: "It is enough for the disciple that he *be as his master*, and the servant as his Lord," &c. Did Matthew mean here, precise equality in kind and degree, between a disciple and his master, and a servant and his Lord? xix. 19: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Did the Saviour mean here, that precisely the same quality and degree of

Digitized by Google

love, which one entertains towards himself, should be entertained towards others? Gen. iii. 22: "Behold the man is become *as* one of us." Did Adam then become, both in nature and degree, equally wise with the Omniscient God? Now, my readers will judge whether or not such a phrase as "men should, or may, honor the Son as they honor the Father," equalizes the Son, in nature and degree, with the Father. As to the verse above quoted, (Matt. xx. 14,) it implies sameness in degree, and not necessarily sameness in kind, for the same sum may be given in different currency. The Editor quotes Heb. iii. 3, 4, in order to shew "in what sense the Prophet to be sent was like Moses." As I examined this verse in page 125, I will not recur to it again. I only remind the Editor of Deut. xviii. 15, 18, where he will perceive in what sense Jehovah himself drew a likeness between the Saviour and Moses, which passage is repeated in Acts iii. 22, and also of St. Matt. xvii. 3, as well as of Mark ix. 4, wherein they express a wish to manifest the same reverence to the Saviour as to Moses and Elias; but it is quite optional with the Editor to treat Moses in any manner he pleases.

In answer to his inquiry, "Why should it offend our author, that when the Son, for the suffering of death, took upon him the form of a servant?" &c. My reply is, that it does not offend me in the least; but I must confess, that such an expression as when God, "for the suffering of death, took upon him the form of a servant," seems to me very extraordinay, as my idea of God is quite at variance with that of a being subjected to death and servitude.

Digitized by Google

The Editor overlooked several other passages, quoted by me, among which there was Matt. xx. 23, "To sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give, but to them for whom it is prepared of my Father."

He perhaps hesitated to rely on the sophistry used by the orthodox, that Jesus denied being possessed of almighty power only in his human capacity. The Editor, it is possible, perceived, that as the *gift* of all power to Jesus, mentioned in Matt. xxviii. 18, is explained by the orthodox of his human capacity; the *denial* of almighty power could not, therefore, be understood of that *very human nature* in which he is said to have possessed it,

FIFTH POSITION.

The Editor says, that "our author's objections to the fifth position, that Jesus's having all judgment committed to him, proves his omniscience, have been so fully met already, that scarcely any thing remains to be added."

In answer to which, I have only to say, that the arguments adduced by the Editor having been previously noticed, it is therefore left to my readers to examine them, and to come to a determination whether they tend to prove the omniscience of the Son or not. The Editor, however, adds here, that omniscience is essential to the act of judging mankind. As I have already dwelt much on this subject in the preceding position, pp. 268, 269, and also in p. 156, I beg to refer my readers to them, wherein they will find that the Son's knowledge of the events

Digitized by Google

of this world extends no farther than as respects the office of judging mankind ; that others are declared to be vested with the power of judging the world as well as the Son; and that the Son positively denies his omniscience in Mark xiii. 32. The Editor concludes by saying, that "his (Father's) giving him 'to have life in himself,' refers wholly to his being the mediator in human flesh." It settles the question at once, that whenever and in whatever capacity Jesus is declared to have had life, he had it as a gift of the Father; and the object of our inquiry and reverence is the Son endowed with life, and not one destitute of it.

SIXTH POSITION.

The Editor begins by observing, that "to the sixth position, that Jesus accepted worship due to God alone, our author objects, 'That the word 'worship,' both in common acceptation and scriptural writings, is used sometimes as implying an external mark of religious reverence paid to God, and at other times as signifying merely the token of civil respect due to superiors; that those who worshipped Jesus did not believe him to be God, or one of the three persons of the Godhead ; and Jesus, in his acknowledged human capacity, never prayed to himself, or directed his followers to worship or pray to him.' Granting that 'worship' in English, and προσκυνεω in Greek, are sometimes used to denote civil respect, and that the worship paid by the servant to his master, Matt. xviii. 26, and by the people to David, meant merely civil respect, still the position is not

Digitized by Google

touched in the least degree." The reason which the Editor assigns for this position not being touched, is, that "whether the blind man, the lepers, the mariners, and others, knew what they did in worshipping Jesus, is not so much the question, as whether Jesus knew; for if he suffered them, even through ignorance, to yield him divine worship, when Peter did not suffer it in Cornelius for a moment; unless he were God, he must have had less discernment, or less piety and concern for the Divine honor, than his own disciples." Page 618.

As the Editor agrees that the term "'worship' in English, and προσκυνεω in Greek, are sometimes used to denote civil respect," it is of course necessary to ascertain whether the blind man, &c. knew what they did in worshipping Jesus; that is, whether they mean to bestow civil respect, or to offer religious reverence. But from all the local circumstances which I pointed out in the Second Appeal, page 193, it is evident that they, as well as Jesus, knew that they were manifesting civil respect only by worshipping him, in the same way as it is evident, from the circumstances of David's not declining to receive worship from the people, and Daniel from king Nebuchadnezzar, that the people and king intended merely civil respect to them. As to Peter's rejection of the worship offered him by Cornelius, it may easily be accounted for, since, as Jesus was endowed with the power of knowing things connected with his divine commission, so Peter had the knowledge of secret events concerning his apostolic duty. From the language which the blind man and others used,

Digitized by Google

and from his knowledge of their thoughts, the Saviour, like other ancient prophets, gave a tacit consent to the worship (or, properly speaking, civil reverence) offered by them; while Peter rejected the worship offered him by Cornelius, knowing that he meant it as an external mark of religious reverence, which was due to God alone, as is evident from the language of Peter, "I myself am a man." Having already noticed the exclamation of Thomas in page 232, 233, and Heb. i. 10, in page 77, I shall not recur to the subject in this place.

The Editor says, "Was Stephen (ignorant) when he committed to him his departing soul, in language similar to that in which Christ on the cross had committed his spirit to the Father?"

The language of Stephen alluded to by the Editor, and that of Christ, bears little resemblance. Among the many expressions attributed to Jesus on the cross, none of them resemble the invocation of Stephen, except that given Luke xxiii. 46, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit;" which is natural for every human being having any idea of God, or feelings of devotion on the approach of death. Stephen's exclamation (Acts vii. 59, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit") was merely an application to Jesus in preference to the angels of death, whom he expected to receive his soul, and convey it to the bosom of the Divinity. The notion of angels of death receiving and conveying away the spirit at the time of dissolution, is familiar to the Jews, in common with other Eastern nations, as appears from their traditions, and from Prov. xvi. 14, "The wrath of

Digitized by Google

a king is as messengers" (in the Hebrew, properly "angels") "of death"—i. e. in a despotic country, the displeasure of the tyrant is equivalent to death. From Stephen's saying, that he saw "the *Son of Man standing* on the right hand of God," we may easily perceive the notion which he had formed of the nature of Jesus Christ.

As to Christ's offering prayers and worship to the Father, and directing his apostles to do so, the Editor attributes them to the "state of humiliation in which his infinite love to sinners had placed him." If Jesus deemed it necessary, in his human capacity, to offer up prayers, thanksgiving, and worship, to God the Father alone, notwithstanding he was *filled* bodily with God the Son, (according to the Editor,) and [to] direct his apostles to follow his example, is it not incumbent also, in following his pattern, to thank, pray to, and worship the Father *alone*, as long as *we* are human? But the truth is, that the assertion of the Editor, attributing Christ's devotion towards God to his human nature, is entirely unsupported by scriptural authority.

The Editor further says, that if Jesus were not God, the apostles, the primitive saints, and the angels in heaven, would be guilty of idolatry, and the Eternal Father of encouraging it.

To quit the Father and Jesus Christ of the charge of encouraging idolatry, and the apostles, and the saints, and the angels, of the sin of idol worship, it suffices to quote Matt. iv. 10, Αυτω μονω λατρευσεις, "Him only shalt thou serve." This commandment of the Father of the universe, to be found in Deut.

Digitized by Google

vi. [13], repeated and communicated to Christians by the most exalted among the prophets, (who enjoins religious adoration to be offered to the Father *alone*,) sufficiently vindicates God and his Christ from the above charge. The apostles so strictly observed this divine communication through their Master, under the Christian dispensation, that, throughout the *whole* New Testament, they applied exclusively to *God alone* this verb, λατρευω, (rendered in the English version "*to serve*,") and not once to Jesus, or to any other being in any book of the New Testament; while on similar occasions, they used for him or others the verbs δουλευω or διακονεω, rendered also in the English version "*to serve*," which tends no less to vindicate them. They further pronounce those who *serve* (from the verb λατρευω) any one except God, to be rebels and idolators,—Rom. i. 25; Acts vii. 42. I now entreat the Editor to examine the subject, and, by following the example of the apostles and primitive saints, glorify a religion intended to be raised far above the debasement of idolatry.

THE SEVENTH AND LAST POSITION.

The Editor having attempted to prove the Deity of the Son, and the personality of the Holy Ghost, from the circumstance of their names being associated with that of the Father of the universe, I observed in my Second Appeal, that "a profession of belief in God is unquestionably common to all religions supposed to have been founded upon the authority of the Old Testament; but each is distinguished from the other by a public profession of faith in their re-

Digitized by Google

spective founders, expressing such profession in a language that may clearly exhibit the inferior nature of those founders to the Divine Being, of whom they declare themselves the messengers." "The Jews claim that they have revelation rendering a belief not in God alone, but in Moses also, incumbent upon them. Exod. xiv. 31: 'The people feared the Lord, and believed the Lord, and his servant Moses,' (to which Jesus also refers in John v. 45, 'There is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye *trust*'). If baptism were administered to one embracing Christianity, in the name of the Father and Holy Spirit, he would thereby no more become enrolled as a Christian than as a Jew or a Mohummudan; for both of them, in common with Christians, would readily submit to be baptized in the name of God, or his prevailing influence over the universe." I afterwards added, in the discussion respecting the Holy Spirit, that "God is invariably represented in revelation as the main object of belief, receiving worship and prayers that proceed from the heart through the first-born of every creature, the Messiah, ('No man cometh unto the Father but by me,') and leading such as worship him in spirit, to righteous conduct, and ultimately to salvation, through his guiding influence, which is called the Holy Spirit, ('When he, the spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you unto all truth'). There is, therefore, a moral obligation on those who avow the truth of such revelation, to profess their belief in God as the sole object of worship; and in the Son, through whom they, as Christians, should offer divine homage; and

Digitized by Google

also in the holy influence of God, from which they should expect direction in the paths of righteousness, as the consequence of their sincere prayer and supplication. For the same reason also, in publicly adopting this religion, it is proper that those who receive it should be baptized in the name of the Father, who is the object of worship; of the Son, who is the mediator; and of that influence by which spiritual blessings are conveyed to mankind, designated in scripture, as the Comforter, Spirit of *Truth*, or Holy Spirit." And to prove the error of the idea that the association of names of individuals with that of God, in a religious profession of belief, which is more essential than any external mark of profession, could identify or equalize those individuals with God, I quoted Exod. xiv. 31, which I have just repeated, and 2 Chron. xx. 20, "Jehoshaphat stood and said, Hear me, O Judah, and ye inhabitants of Jerusalem; believe in the Lord your God, so shall ye be established; believe his prophets, so shall ye prosper,"—wherein the names of Moses and the prophets of God are associated with that of the Deity. Besides, I observed to the Editor, that "fire-worshippers, for instance, insisting on the literal sense of the words, in example of the Rev. Editor, might *refer to that* text in the third chapter of Matthew, repeated in Luke iii. 16, in which it is announced that Jesus 'will baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire;' and they might contend, that if the association, in the rite of baptism, of the names of the Son and Holy Ghost with that of the Father, be supposed to prove their divinity, it is clear that Fire also, being associ-

Digitized by Google

ated with the Holy Ghost in the same rite, must likewise be considered as a part of the Godhead." He keeps all these arguments out of view, and, according to his usual mode of reasoning, repeats again in his reply what he thought the purport of Heb. i. 10, Rev. ii. 29, and has recourse again to the angel of Bochim, &c. which, having no relation to the subject in question, and having been often examined in the preceding pages, I shall pass by here. His only remark concerning this last position is, that "had the passage" (respecting *belief in God and his servant Moses*) "quoted from Exod. xiv. 31, been *that* formulary, instead of being a part of a narrative, the omission in the baptismal rite of the clause 'his servant,' would have been fatal to his objection. If, then, the phrase 'his servant,' marks the inferior nature of this messenger of God, the omission of it in the circumstances just mentioned, unavoidably proves the equality of the Father and the Son," &c. In the first place, it is too obvious to need proof, that every circumstance mentioned in the sacred scriptures, even in the form of narrative, if approved of God, is worthy of attention, though not stated in the formulary of a religious rite. But, in the second place, the passage quoted by me from 2 Chronicles, is a commandment enjoining belief in God and his Prophets, even with the omission, so much desired by our Editor, of the term "his *servants*." Does this formulary, I ask, with the omission of the term "his *servants*," prove the equality of the Father and the Prophets, from the circumstance of their being associated with God in a solemn religious injunction?

Digitized by Google

In the third place, the term "Son," equally with the word "servant," denotes the inferiority of Jesus as plainly as any expression intended to denote inferiority can possibly do. But the Editor says, that "never was there a more humble begging of the question than the assertion that the epithet 'Son' ought to be understood and admitted by every one as expressing the created nature of Christ;—why ought it thus to be understood and admitted?" I answer, because common sense tells us that a son, as well as a servant, must be acknowledged to be inferior to his father or master. Again, we find David called the son of God, Solomon the son of God, Adam the son of God, and, in short, the whole children of Israel denominated sons of God; yet represented in scripture as inferior to God their Father; nay, moreover, Jesus the Son of God positively declares himself to be inferior to his Father,—"My Father is greater than I."

Our Editor puts again another query, (p. 622,) "Can he even prove that among men a son must be of a nature inferior to his father?" I reply by putting another question to him: Can the Editor ever prove, that among men a servant *must be* of a nature inferior to his master? If he cannot, are we to suppose Moses, a servant of God, equal in nature with the Deity? The fact is, that among men a servant, a son, and a grandson, are of the same nature with their masters, or fathers; but when creation is not effected in the ordinary course of nature, there need not be, and is not, an identity of nature between one who is called father, and another called son; so

Digitized by Google

when service is performed by *men* to others not of their own kind, oneness of nature is not necessarily found between the servant and the person served.

The Editor concludes the proposition, saying that "Our author declines renewing the subject relative to Christ's declaration, 'Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world,' which, however, we are not aware he has ever yet discussed." The fact is, in examining Matt. xviii. 20, "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them," which the Editor quoted to establish the ubiquity of the Son, I inquired in my Second Appeal, "Is it not evident that the Saviour meant here, by being in the midst of two or three of his disciples, his guidance to them when joined together in searching for the truth? We find similar expressions in the scriptures, wherein the guidance of the Prophets of God is also meant by words that would imply their presence." Luke xvi. 29: "Abraham said unto him, They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them." And upon the Editor's quoting Matt. xxviii. 20, "I am with you always, even to the end of the world," in all probability to establish the ubiquity of Jesus, I said in my Second Appeal, (page 199,) "I will not renew the subject, as it has been already discussed in examining the first position;" having shewn there that by the presence of Christ, and that of other Prophets that may be observed in any part of the Bible, their spiritual guidance should be understood. My readers, therefore, may judge whether or not the purport of the last-mentioned verse is connected with

Digitized by Google

the subject discussed in examining the first positio I entreat the Editor, however, to reflect on the last phrase of the verse in question, i. e. "always to the end of the world," which, so far from evincing Christ's eternal existence, implies that his influence over his disciples extended only to the end of the world, when he shall be himself subject to the Father of the universe. (1 Cor. xv. 28.)

CHAPTER VI.

On the Holy Spirit and other Subjects.

I EXPRESSED my surprise, in my Second Appeal, page 227, at the Editor's having "noticed, in so short and abrupt a manner, the question of the personality and deity of the Holy Ghost, although the Editor esteems the Son and the Spirit as equally distinct persons of the Godhead." I feel now still more surprised to observe, that the Editor, in his present review also, has noticed, in the same brief manner, the personality of the Holy Ghost; as, while he fills more than a hundred pages in support of the deity of the *second* person, he has not allowed even a single page to the question of the *third*. He, at the same time, overlooks almost all the arguments I have advanced against his feeble attempt to prove the personality and deity of the Holy Spirit, from pp. 227 to 241, and in many other places of the Second Appeal. The Editor, however, first says, that "If he,

Digitized by Google

in whom dwelt all truth, has declared him (the Holy Ghost, in Matt. xxviii. 19) to be as distinct in person, and as worthy of worship and adoration, as the Father and himself, no further evidence is needed either to his personality or Godhead." Had the Editor thought the quotation of a single verse a sufficient excuse for avoiding the discussion of the personality of the Holy Ghost, he might have, on the same ground, omitted to discuss the subject of the deity of Jesus Christ, by noticing, in like manner, a single verse of scripture, which he considered as a proof of the divine nature of the Son, and thus saved me the trouble of a long controversy. If the association of names, in a religious rite, were to be admitted as a proof of the personality of the Holy Spirit, the power of God, another divine attribute, should be considered God himself, it being also mentioned jointly with the Holy Spirit in the rite of unction (Acts x. 38); and Fire also should be supposed to be a distinct person of the Godhead, because we find Fire associated with the Holy Ghost, in the same rite of baptism as I before observed (Luke iii. 16); but I shall not recur to this subject, having fully examined it in pp. 280, 281.

Notwithstanding my plain declaration, in the Second Appeal, p. 239, that "with respect to the Holy Ghost, I must confess my inability to find *a single passage* in the whole scriptures, in which the Spirit is addressed as God, or as a person of God, so as to afford believers of the Trinity an excuse for their profession of the Godhead of the Holy Ghost;" the Editor thought it advisable not to dwell on the sub-

Digitized by Google

ject, and only observes, " Were it not needful, indeed a rich fulness of scripture proof could be adduced respecting the Holy Spirit, as well as the Son; but the selection of a few passages will be quite sufficient." These are as follows: the first are from the Gospel of St. John, xiv. 13, 26, xvi. 8, 11, and the last are from Acts x. 20, and xii. 2. The Editor here overlooks entirely what I stated in the Second Appeal, on this very point; that is, if from the consideration of such expressions as, "God will send the Holy Spirit," "the Holy Spirit will teach you," "The Holy Spirit will reprove the world," "The Holy Spirit will glorify me," the Spirit be acknowledged a separate person of the Deity, what would the Editor say of other attributes, such as mercy, wrath, truth, &c. which are also, in a similar manner, personified in various instances? Psalm lvii. 3: "God shall *send forth* his mercy and truth." lxxxv. 10: "Mercy and truth are *met* together; righteousness and peace have *kissed* each other." lxxxix. 14: "Mercy and truth shall go before thy face." xciv. 18: "My foot slippeth; thy mercy, O Lord, held me up." "Thy mercy, O Lord, is in the heavens." "For there is wrath gone out from the Lord." Numb. xvi. 46.

In the course of citing the above verses of John and Acts, the Editor quotes Acts v. 3, "Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Spirit?" [4,] "Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God;" whence he concludes, that he that lieth to the Holy Spirit, lieth to God, and, consequently, the Spirit is God. On this inference I have already observed, in

Digitized by Google

my former Appeal, that any sin or blasphemy against one of the attributes of God, is, of course, accounted a sin or blasphemy against God himself. But this admission amounts neither to a recognition of the self-existence of the attribute, nor of its identity with God. I then referred the Editor to Matt. x. 40, "He that receiveth you, receiveth me;" and now I beg his attention to 1 Cor. viii. 12, "But when ye sin so against the brethren, and wound their weak conscience, ye sin against Christ." Do these passages identify or equalize the apostles of Jesus with himself? Nothing but early-acquired and long-established prejudices can prevent any literary character from perceiving such a gross error. As to Acts x. 20, if the speaker be admitted, according to the Editor, as a separate person, he must then be identified either with the spirit of Cornelius, who had actually sent the three men mentioned in ver. 19, as is evident from ver. 8, or with the angel of God, who ordered Cornelius to send them to Peter, (Ver. 5,) a conclusion which would not, after all, suit the purpose of the Editor. I entreat the Editor to take notice, at least, of some of my arguments against the personality of the Holy Spirit, mentioned in chapter VI. of the Second Appeal, pp. 231—234, or, if he declines adventuring on this point of theology, let him candidly reduce the supposed persons of the Godhead from a Trinity to Duality, and this point being gained, I may then continue my efforts with renewed hope of reducing this Duality to the Everlasting and Indivisible Unity.

The Editor concludes his Essay with saying,

Digitized by Google

(p. 624,) "The deity and the personality of the Son and the Holy Spirit, being established, the doctrine of the ever-blessed Trinity needs no further confirmation : it follows of course. We shall, therefore, close our testimonies from scripture, by laying before our readers three passages, which bring the sacred Three fully into view. The first we select from Isaiah xlviii. [13,] in which one is introduced who previously declares, 'My hand also hath laid the foundation of the earth', &c., and whom, therefore, we are at no loss to recognize. He, however, declares verse 16, 'And now the Lord God and his Spirit hath sent me.'" Now, supposing the person who declares himself, in verse 16, to have been sent by the Lord God and his Spirit, is one of the persons of the Godhead, whose hand hath laid the foundation of the earth, according to the Editor; this admission would be so far advantageous to the cause of the Editor, as respects the plurality of persons in the Deity; but it would be totally fatal to his grand object, since it would substitute Isaiah as a divine person, in the place of Jesus Christ. Isaiah the Prophet is the grand speaker throughout the whole of his book; who declares himself often to have been sent by God as a messenger to Israel. He often speaks abruptly in behalf of God, as if God were speaking himself in the course of his own discourse, as I noticed in p. 82, and sometimes again he suddenly introduces his own sentiments, while he is announcing the words of Jehovah, without making any distinction. I mention here only a few instances. Isaiah lxiii. 6: "I will tread down the people in

Digitized by Google

mine anger, and make them drunk in my fury, and I will bring down their strength to the earth." (7.) "*I will* mention the loving-kindness of the Lord, and the praises of the Lord, according to all that the Lord hath bestowed on us." Does not the Prophet *introduce himself*, in verse 7, most abruptly, while speaking himself in behalf of God, in ver. 6? Ch. l. 3: "I clothe the heavens with blackness, and I make sackcloth their covering." (4.) "The Lord God hath *given me* the tongue of the learned, that I should know how to speak a word in season to him that is weary," &c. Here the Prophet introduces himself, in verse 4, in the same abrupt manner, without intimation of any change of person.

I now cite the context of the very verse of Isaiah quoted by the Editor, to enable my readers to judge how far "it brings the sacred Three fully into view." (14.) "All ye (the inhabitants of Judah) assemble yourselves, and hear; who among them (Israel) hath declared these things? The Lord hath loved him (Cyrus* of Persia, the conqueror of Babylon). He (the Lord) will do *his pleasure on Babylon*, and his arm shall be on the Chaldeans." (15.) "I, even I, have spoken; yea, I have *called him*, (Cyrus,) I have brought him, and he shall make his way prosperous." (16.) "Come ye near unto me, (says the prophet,) hear ye this, I have not spoken in secret from the beginning; from the time that it was, there am I: (that is, from the first time

* Isaiah xliv. 7: "And who, as I, *shall call* and shall declare it?" &c. (28.) "That saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure." xlvi. 11. "*Calling* a ravenous bird from the *east*, the man that *executeth my counsel* from a far country: yea, I have spoken it, I will also *bring it* to pass; I have purposed it, I will also do it."

Digitized by Google

of these events:) and now the Lord God and his Spirit hath sent me." (17.) Expressions similar to the phrase, "From the time that it was, there am I," are often used by the Prophets. Vide Jer. i. 5: "And before thou camest forth out of the womb, I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a Prophet unto the nations." And so Isaiah xlix. 1. No one, I presume, that ever read, even with common attention, the book of Isaiah, (in which speakers are introduced without any distinction, more frequently than in the other scriptural books,) would attempt to prove the Trinity or the Deity of Jesus Christ, from the passage quoted by the Editor, unless he is previously biassed by some human creed, and thereby absolutely prevented from comparing impartially one passage with the other.

The Editor perhaps means the personality and the deity of the Holy Spirit by the phrase, "The Lord God and his Spirit hath sent me,"* (verse 16,) seemingly representing the Spirit of God as a co-operator with himself. He might, in that case, on the same ground, endeavor to establish the personality and the deity of *Righteousness*, another attribute of the Deity, as being represented with God as an agent in Isaiah lix. [16,] "Therefore his arm brought salvation unto him, and his Righteousness, it sustained him." And he might also attempt to prove the personality and deity of the breath of God, which is, in like manner, represented as a co-

* In the original Hebrew, the last phrase stands thus: "The Lord Jehovah hath sent me and his Spirit," which bear two constructions; first, "The Lord Jehovah hath sent me, and hath sent his Spirit." The second is, "The Lord Jehovah and his Spirit hath sent me."

Digitized by Google

operator with the Spirit of God. Job xxxiii. 4: "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of him hath given life." Is this the best of the proofs of the Trinity with which the Editor closes his testimonies? If such be his proofs, I am at a loss to guess what his illustrations will be. The second passage, quoted by the Editor, is what I have just examined in pp. 278—281. The third is, 2 Cor. xiii. 14, "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit, be with you all. Amen." Here the apostle prays, that the guidance of Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the constant operation of the holy influence of God, may be with Christians, since, without the guidance of Jesus, no one can be thoroughly impressed with the love of the Deity under the Christian dispensation, nor can that love of God continue to exist unless preserved by divine influence; a fact which I have demonstrated, pp. 284—286, in examining Matt. xxviii. 19. But what has this passage to do with the proof of the deity of Jesus and the personality of the Holy Spirit? Does not Paul call the Phillipians partakers of *his own* grace? Phil. i. 17. Is not every man pure in heart, declared to be possessed of the grace of his lips; that is, verbal instructions? Prov. xxii. 11. Is not, in Psalm xxiii. 6, the communion of goodness and mercy desired for all the days of life? Can such expressions be also considered as proofs of the deity of Paul, or of the personality of these attributes? I hope and pray the Editor may take all those circumstances into his serious consideration.

Digitized by Google

I now examine the remaining few of those passages, which I intended to notice in a subsequent Chapter of this Essay. The first is, Zech. xii. 10. "In that day they shall look upon me whom they have pierced," compared with John xix. 37, "They shall look on him whom they pierced." To shew the error in the translation of the verse in the English version, I quoted in my Second Appeal, the verse in the original Hebrew, and a translation thereof from the Arabic Bible, and another from the Septuagint, with a literal English translation, which I repeat: "And they shall look toward me on account of him whom they have pierced." But in order to destroy the validity of the Arabic Bible and that of the Septuagint, the Editor says, that "the Greek and Arabic versions are nothing to the original text itself." I perfectly agree with him in this assertion, but I am convinced, that the Editor must be better acquainted than myself with the prevailing and continued practice among Christian theologians, to have recourse to the versions, especially to the Septuagint, when a dispute arises in the interpretation of any text of the Old Testament, and to give preference to the authority of the Septuagint, even over that of Jerome's, which the Editor quotes in opposition to the Arabic and Greek versions.

As to the original text, the Editor first observes that "as to the particle את *eth*, which the best Hebrew grammars define a particle marking the accusative case governed by active verbs, or an emphatic particle denoting the very thing itself." I therefore think it proper to quote Parkhurst's opin-

Digitized by Google

ion on the particle את *eth*, from his Hebrew Lexicon, that my readers may judge whether or not the above rule, laid down by the Editor, is founded upon good authority. Parkhurst (p. 48): "The Lexicons say, that when joined with a verb, it (*eth*) denotes the *accusative* case, if the verb be *active*; see Gen. i. 1, and al freq., but the *nominative*, if the verb be *passive* or *neuter*. Gen. xxvii. 45; Deut. xx. 8; Josh. vii. 15, &c., al freq. But, in truth, it is the sign of no particular case, that *distinction* being *unknown* in *Hebrew*. See Josh. xxii. 17; Ezek. xxxv. 10; Numb. x. 2; 1 Sam. xvii. 34; 2 Sam. xv. 23; Neh. ix. 19, 34; 2 Kings vi. 5." Parkhurst gives also the second meaning of this particle—" 2, *with*, *to*, *towards*, Exod. i. 1, Deut. vii. 8," which the Editor also partially admits.

The fact is, this particle denotes an accusative case as well as other cases, and also stands for the English prepositions, "with," "for," "towards," &c. and, therefore, the verse in question, as it is found in our Hebrew copies of the Old Testament, should indisputably be thus read, in consistence with its context, 31: "And they shall look towards me for (or on account of) him whom they have pierced," or "They shall look upon me with him whom they have pierced."*

* Newcome reads, "And they shall look on him whom they pierced." His note on this translation is as follows: "On him.] Thirty-six MSS. and two ed. read אליו: three other MSS. read so originally; six perhaps read so; six read so now; and eleven have אליו in the margin, as Keri. And yet אלי *on me*, may be traced in the ancient versions and Chald. אליו was also noted as a various lection by R. Saadias, who lived about the year 900. See Kenn. diss. gen. § 43. 'Citant אליו Talmud et R. Saadias Haggaion. Poc. Append. in Mal.' Secker. 'Dr. Owen shews that Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Irenaus, Tertullian, and Barnabas, favor the reading of אליו Inquiry—Sept. Version Sect. iv."

Digitized by Google

The Editor quotes, to my great surprise, (in page 546,) some verses in which the particle את requires an accusative case, and consequently, no preposition "for," "to," or "with," can be properly placed. But I beg to ask the Editor, how he can turn the following verses to his purpose, wherein no accusative case after the particle את can be at all admitted? Exodus i. 1: "Now these are the names of the children of Israel, which came into Egypt; every man and his household came *with* Jacob." Would the Editor thus render the particle here requiring an accusative case,—"every man and his household came Jacob"? Would the verse in this case bear any sense? Gen. xliv. 4: יצאו את העיר הם "They were gone *out* of the city." There the particle stands for "out of," or "from." iv. 1: "I have gotten a man *from* the Lord." Here the preposition "from" is substituted for this very Hebrew particle. In Deut. vii. 8, we have יהוה אתכם כי מאהבת, literally, "on account of the love of God for you," though thus rendered in the English version, "Because the Lord loved you."*

In the course of examining this subject, the Editor quotes, "Thy throne, O Jehovah, is forever and ever." I shall feel obliged, if he will kindly let me know from what book of the Old or New Testament he has selected this verse, containing the term "Jehovah," in the first part of the text.

As to my remarks on Zech. xiii. 7, "Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man

* Archbishop Secker, in Newcome, has the following remark: "Potest את אשר notare *eo quod*, ut vertunt ό. ch. vel *quem*. Vide Nold. Et sic post Dativum adhibetur, Jer. xxxviii. 9."

Digitized by Google

that is my fellow, saith Jehovah of hosts; smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered," the Editor agrees partly with me; saying, "No one doubts that the Saviour placed himself in subjection ty the Father, when he condescended to become subject to death." He, however, wishes to prove the deity of Jesus Christ by the application of the word *fellow* (עמית) to him. He here quotes Micah [v. 2], "Whose goings forth were from everlasting;" and John [i. 1], "And the word was with God," which have no relation to the term עמית or *fellow* found in the verse in question; and as these quotations of the Editor have been examined in pp. 213, 234, I shall not recur to them in this place. He lastly quotes Parkhurst, to shew that עמית "implies a neighbor, a member of the same society." Is not this quotation, defining the Hebrew word עמית as "a neighbor," directly against the object of the Editor? If Christ is represented, either in a real or figurative sense, as standing on the *right hand* of the Deity, taking precedence of all those that believe in him as the promised Messiah sent from God, would it be inconsistent in itself, or an acknowledgement of his deity to use the word עמית or neighbor for Christ? My readers will observe, from the following quotations, that this very term עמית which is rendered *fellow* in the verse in question, is translated "neighbor" by the very authors of the English version, in many other instances. Levit. vi. 2, "or hath deceived his *neighbor*." The last word is a translation of the term עמית: xix. 17, "Thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy '*neighbor*,'" or *immeeth:* ch. xxv. 14, 15.

Digitized by Google

The Editor, in speaking of Christ, repeats, now and then, the phrase, "God blessed forever," perhaps alluding to Romans ix. 5.—Among all the interpretations given to this text, for or against the Trinity, there is the Paraphrase of Locke, of whose name the literary world is so justly proud, which I here first quote:—"Had the patriarchs, to whom the promises were made, for their (the Israelites) forefathers; and of them, as to his fleshly* extraction, Christ is come, he who is over all, God be blessed. Amen." Secondly, I shall cite here some scriptural passages to shew that it was customary with Jewish writers to address abrupt exclamations to God while treating of some other subjects, that my readers may be convinced that the sudden introduction of the phrase, "God be blessed forever," in ver. 5, by St. Paul, was perfectly consistent with the style of the sacred writings. Psalm lxxxix. 51, 52: "Wherewith thine enemies have reproached, O Lord; wherewith they have reproached the footsteps of thine anointed. *Blessed be the Lord forever more. Amen and amen.*" Psalm civ. 35: "Let the sinners be consumed out of the earth, and let the wicked be no more. *Bless thou the Lord, O my soul. Praise ye the Lord.*"

If St. Paul, in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, and in that to the Ephesians, declares positively that the Father is the only being who has the right to the epithet "*God,*" under the Christian dispensation, he could not, as an inspired writer, be guilty of so palpable a contradiction, as to apply this very epithet

* Vide ver. the 3rd of the same chapter, in which Paul speaks of his "Kinsmen according to the flesh."

Digitized by Google

to the Christ of God, on another occasion. 1 Cor. viii. 6: "But to us (Christians) there is but *one God the Father*." Eph. i. 17: "That the God *of our Lord Jesus* Christ, the *Father* of glory," &c. iv. 5, 6: "One Lord, one faith, one baptism: *One God and Father of all*, who is above all, through *all*, and in us *all*."

Respecting 1 John v. 20, I beg to refer to the rule laid down by Bishop Middleton, (of whom the Editor speaks highly and justly, in p. 535,) in his work on the Greek Article, p. 79: "When two or more attributives, joined by a copulative or copulatives, are *assumed* of the same person or thing, before the first attributive the article is *inserted*; before the remaining ones it is omitted." In the passage under consideration there are two attributives joined by a copulative, and in order to ascertain whether they are assumed of the *same* person, or of *different* persons, it is only necessary to observe, that the article is inserted not only before the first attributive, but also before the second, and that, consequently, "the true God" is one person, and "the eternal life" is another. This perfectly corresponds with the preceding part of the verse, in which "he that is true," and "his Son Jesus Christ," are separately mentioned.

Finding the practice of the primitive Christians, during the first three centuries, unfavorable to his sentiments, the Editor prudently keeps it out of view altogether, merely observing, (p. 625,) into that "we do not even inquire. Paul tells us, that, even in his time, 'the mystery of iniquity' had already begun to work; and John adds, that 'many Antichrists' had

Digitized by Google

already gone out into the world." The Editor must be well aware that those in whom the mystery of iniquity was found, and who were detected as antichrists, were not in the fellowship of true Christians, and consequently church histories treat of the practice of the latter entirely distinct from that of the former; and it is therefore evident, that the practice and professions of primitive Christians, who were, generally, the contemporaries of the apostles or their disciples, are worthy of inquiry for the regulation of the conduct of the Christians of these days.

As to Mosheim, the Editor says, "Even Mosheim, suspected as he is of being unfavorable to the truth, establishes their faith in Christ's deity in the very passage quoted, [Second Appeal] p. 247, by our author against this doctrine." It appears from this quotation, that they, when baptized, "made *solemn* profession of their confidence in Christ." The Jews, as well as almost all the Gentiles, professed their belief in God; but the thing which was required of them by the apostles was, that they should make profession of confidence in Jesus as the Christ of God in the rite of baptism. If such a profession of confidence in Christ is admitted by the Editor as a sufficient acknowledgment of his deity, why should he be so hostile to those (whom he styles Unitarians) who are baptized in the name of Jesus, and also *profess* their solemn *confidence* in *him*? Still further am I surprized. that, when the apostle John expressly wrote his gospel to prove "that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God," (ch. xx. 31,) the Editor, so far from being satisfied with those who receive

Digitized by Google

Jesus in the character expressed by these terms, ("the Christ, the Son of God,") in the sense which they uniformly bear in the scriptures, requires them, moreover, to believe that Jesus Christ is the very and eternal God, and thus not only defeats the object of the apostle, but even contradicts him in express language.

The Editor then proceeds to say, "Respecting Locke and Newton, our reply is precisely the same; their opinions in divinity are nothing to us." The Editor, elated by the general prevalence of the orthodox system, effected only by perversions of the sense of the divine writings, attempts to turn the authorities of these great men also to his own purpose. "If (says he) Locke, as our author affirms, [Second Appeal] (p. 305) really thought that the faith which makes men Christians, includes their receiving Jesus Christ for their Lord and King, Locke knew that this included the belief of his omniscience and omnipresence, as, without this, his being their King was only a solemn mockery." The Editor prudently quotes here only a part of the sentence of Locke quoted by me, which he thought might give him an opportunity of making comments favorable to his creed; but it is fortunate for us that his works, being written and printed in English, are not liable to much critical perversion. Locke says, "that the believing Jesus to be the Messiah, includes in it a receiving him for our Lord and King, PROMISED AND SENT FROM GOD." The phrase chosen by that celebrated author, "*sent from God*," denies the deity of Christ beyond doubt, since one sent by

Digitized by Google

another is of course different from him who sends him. To avoid every misconstruction being thrown upon his definition, Locke chose the term "God," instead of any other term in the above phrase, that Jesus might be understood separately from God, without the least room for the sophistry that might represent him as God the Son, sent from God the Father. We, however, are not at a loss to discover what Locke meant by the terms "Lord and King," when referred to Jesus, as he fully explained them in his Paraphrase on the Epistles to the Corinthians. As to the term "*Lord*," I refer to the note on 1 Cor. i. 2: "What the apostle means by *Lord*, when he attributes it to Christ, vide viii. 6." Paraphrase on viii. 6: "Yet to us Christians there is but *one God, the Father and Author of all things*, to whom *alone* we address *all our* worship and service; and one Lord, viz. Jesus Christ, by whom all things come *from* God *to us*, and by whom we have access to the Father." As to the term "*King*," I quote his Paraphrase on ch. xv. 24, which clearly represents his sovereignty as *finite:* "After that shall be the day of judgment, which shall bring to a conclusion, and finish the whole dispensation to the race and posterity of Adam, in this world: when Christ shall have *delivered up the kingdom to God the Father*, which he shall not do till he hath destroyed all empire, power, and authority, that shall be in the world besides."

The Editor says of Sir Isaac Newton, "His belief of Christ's deity appears as clear as the light, from our author's own quotation, when he said that Christians of all ages are represented as worshipping

Digitized by Google

God and the Lamb." Newton was too circumspect to leave his word liable to perversions by the popular opinion. He explains the sense in which Christians worship God, and also the sense in which they worship Jesus—the one as directly opposed to the other as the west to the east. Newton says, "God for his benefaction in *creating all things*, and the Lamb for his benefaction in *redeeming* with his blood; God as sitting upon the throne and living *forever*, and the Lamb exalted above all *by the merits of his death.*" The worship offered to the latter is therefore merely a manifestation of civil reverence, as I pointed out in p. 274.

To equalize a being exalted and worshipped for his meritorious *death*, with the eternal Supreme Sovereign of the universe, is only an attempt to bring the nature of the Deity on a level with a mortal creature, and by no means serves to elevate that creature to the rank of the Deity. If the Editor consider these quotations from Locke and Newton really orthodox, how inconsistent he must be in condemning those whose sentiments as to the person of Jesus Christ are precisely the same; to wit, that he is the anointed Lord and King promised and sent from God, is worthy of worship for his mediation and meritorious death, but by no means as a being possessed of a two-fold nature, divine and human, perfect God and perfect Man!

As to my remarks on certain abstruse reasonings resorted to by the orthodox, the Editor further says, that he needs them not, thereby avowedly relinquishing reason in support of the Trinity; but, hap-

Digitized by Google

pily, he asserts at the same time, that "to us the scriptures are sufficient." I therefore entreat him to point out a single scriptural authority, treating of a compound God of three persons, and of a compound Messiah, one of these three persons constituted of a two-fold nature, divine and human.

The Editor alludes to the term "antichrists," found in the Epistle of John; but I am glad that we most fortunately are furnished with the definition of this term by that inspired writer, which decides at once the question who are the real subjects of its application. 1 John iv. 3: "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God; and this is that spirit of antichrist." We accordingly rejoice to confess that Jesus Christ, who came in the flesh, is OF GOD, and that not only he, but his apostles also were of God (1 John iv. 6, v. 19); but we feel sincerely for those who violate this standard, either by falling short or going beyond it, by denying that Jesus Christ is OF GOD, or by affirming that Jesus Christ is God himself, since both these assertions,—to wit, "Jesus Christ is NOT of God," and "Jesus Christ IS God,"—are equally incompatible with John's proposition, that "Jesus Christ is OF GOD." For example: The prime minister, by the law of the land, is appointed by the king, and consequently is acknowledged to be OF THE KING; to say, therefore, that he is not of the king, would be to detract from the minister's dignity; but to say that the prime minister is the king, is not only inconsistent with the assertion that the prime minister is of the king, but would be pro-

Digitized by Google

nounced high treason; in like manner as deifying the Christ of God, is both an affront to God, and an *antichristian* doctrine.

Lastly, I tender my humble thanks for the Editor's kind suggestion in inviting me to adopt the doctrine of the Holy Trinity; but I am sorry to find that I am unable to benefit by this advice. After I have long relinquished every idea of a plurality of Gods, or of the persons of the Godhead, taught under different systems of modern Hindooism, I cannot conscientiously and consistently embrace one of a similar nature, though greatly refined by the religious reformations of modern times; since whatever arguments can be adduced against a plurality of gods, strike with equal force against the doctrine of a plurality of persons of the Godhead; and, on the other hand, whatever excuse may be pleaded in favor of a plurality of persons of the Deity, can be offered with equal propriety in defence of Polytheism.

I now conclude my Essay by offering up thanks to the Supreme Disposer of the events of this universe, for having unexpectedly delivered this country from a long-continued tyranny of its former rulers, and placed it under the government of the English, —a nation who not only are blessed with the enjoyment of civil and political liberty, but also interest themselves in promoting liberty and social happiness, as well as free inquiry into literary and religious subjects, among those nations to which their influence extends.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

INDEX.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE

THANKS to the Reverend Editor for his labors 7
Author's Vindication of himself from the charge of presumption 8
Necessity has driven the Author to these publications . ib.
Quotation of a part of "The Introduction to the Precepts of Jesus," in proof of this . . . . ib.
Author's precaution in the Second Appeal 9
Quotation of some parts of the First Appeal . . . ib.
The assertion of the Editor as to his ignorance of the Author's belief 10
Author's public avowal of his faith 11
Author's vindication of himself from the charge of vanity . ib.
Unbiassed common sense suffices to find the unscripturality of the Trinity : . . . . ib.
Experiment proposed 12
The Editor's ridiculing of the suggestion offered as to the study of the Bible . . . . ib.
The reason assigned for his disapproval of the suggestion . ib.
Impossibility of a belief in the Trinity and Hindoo Polytheism, unless inculcated in youth 13
No liberal parent can take advantage of the confiding credulity of his children; The duties of liberal parents . . . ib.
The force of early-acquired prejudices 14
Traditional instructions inculcated in childhood one of the causes of prevailing errors in Christianity 15
The Editor's ironical remarks on the success of the Author in scriptural studies, noticed . . . . ib.
The reason assigned by the Editor, for his omission of several arguments in the Second Appeal, noticed 17
The Editor's position of the insufficiency of the Precepts of Jesus to procure men salvation, noticed . . . . . ib.
The irregular mode of arguing adopted by the Editor . . . 18
The sufficiency of the Precepts of Jesus for salvation proved . 19
Mark xii. 29, "Hear O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord," referred to 20

Digitized by Google

PAGE

Matt. vii. 24, "Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine," referred to . . . . *ib.*

John xv. 10, "If ye keep my commandments," &c. and v. 14; Matt. xxv. 31, et. seq. referred to . . . . . . *ib.*

The argument adduced by the Editor to depreciate the weight of the passage, "This do, and thou shalt live," examined . 21

The Editor's question "Did Jesus regard the lawyer as sinless?" answered 22

The verse "If righteousness came by [the] law," &c. explained 23

The Editor's omission to notice those passages that represent repentance as a sufficient means for procuring pardon . 24

Luke v. 32, xxiv. 47, xiii. 3, referred to . . . . . *ib.*

The parable of the prodigal son, referred to . . . . *ib.*

Psalm li. 17, "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit," &c. Ezek. xviii. 30, referred to 25

Prov. xvi. 6, "By mercy and truth iniquity is purged," &c. Isaiah i. 18; Human justice, referred to . . . . . *ib.*

CHAPTER II.

Inquiry into the doctrine of the Christian Atonement.—A *change* of arrangement by the Editor 26

Gen. iii. 15, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman," &c. examined . . . . *ib.*

Gen. iv. 4, "The sacrifice offered by Abel, and approved of God, in preference to his brother Cain's, examined . . 29

John viii. 56; Heb. xi. 26, noticed; Heb. xi. 4, referred to 29, 30

How far sacrifices are divine institutions 31

Micah vi. 7, 8, referred to . . . . *ib.*

Hosea vi. 6, Isaiah i. 11, [16—18,] Psalm l. 8, [8—15,] referred to 32

[1] Sam. xv. 22; Prov. xxi. 3; Eccl. v. 1, referred to . . 33

In what sense such expressions as "This man after he had offered one sacrifice for sins," and others like them, should be *taken* . . . . *ib.*

Common notions of justice; Exod. xx. 5; Matt. xviii. 8, referred to 35

Numb. xiv. 19, 20; 2 Chron. xxx. 18—20; Psalm cvi. 23, xxxii. 5, referred to 36

Psalm cxli. 2; Isaiah lv. 7; Jer. vii. 21—23, referred to . 37

Heb. x. 4, "It is not possible that the blood of bulls," &c. examined . . . . *ib.*

Gen. xxii. 3, [13,]; Heb. x. 5, referred to 38, 39

Digitized by Google

PAGE

The death of Jesus was a spiritual and virtual sacrifice . *ib.*
Such terms as the "sacrifice," "atonement for sin," &c. being familiar to the Jews, were adopted by the apostles . . 40
Priesthood without sacrifice exists under the Christian dispensation . . . . *ib.*
1 Peter ii. 4, 5, quoted in proof of spiritual sacrifices . . *ib.*
Rev. i. 6, xx. 6 ; 1 Peter v. 5, referred to 41
Protestants explain such phrases as, "Unless ye eat his flesh," &c. in a spiritual sense . . . . *ib.*
The Editor's reference to Noah's sacrifice, and God's promise to Abraham, and his quoting Job, [xix. 25,] "I know that my Redeemer liveth," &c. examined 41, 42
Matt. v. 8, 11, Luke xi. 28, referred to 42
Isaiah lxiii. 16, lx. 16; Job xix. 24—26 referred to . . 43
The sense in which the application of the term "Lamb" is made to Jesus, discussed 44
John xxi. 15 ; Luke x. 3 ; Gen. xxii. 7, 8 ; Jer. xi. 19, "But I was like a Lamb," &c. referred to 45
The account of the scape-goat, examined 46
Exod. xxviii. 38, referred to . . . . *ib.*
Psalm ii. 1, compared with Acts iv. [25, 26,] and Psalm xvi. 8—11, compared with Acts ii. 25, 27, &c. &c. noticed as bearing no relation to the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus . . 46, 47
Psalm xl. 6—8, examined by referring to their context . . 48
The object of Jesus's mission was to deliver divine instructions 49
John x. 17, "Therefore doth my Father love me," &c. examined *ib.*
Jesus's aversion to death like many other prophets . . 50
Matt. xxvi. 36, [37—39,] 42, referred to . . . . . *ib.*
Mark xiv. 36 ; Luke xxii. 42—44, referred to . . . 51
The assertion of the Editor that "This iniquity, if it be such, the Father willed," examined 52
The Editor's objection to the application of human notions of justice to judge the unsearchable things of God, examined . 53
The Editor's applying human notions of justice to Divine things 54
The orthodox divines, like the Editor, have recourse to human notions of justice in their attempt to prove the atonement of Christ 55
Examination of Isaiah vii. 14, deferred to the subsequent chapter 56
Isaiah xi. [3] "And he shall make him of quick understanding," &c. examined ; Isaiah xix. 19, 20, noticed . . . . . *ib.*
The Editor's attempt to prove the atonement from the application of the term "Saviour" to Jesus, examined . . 56, 57
Matt. ix. 8 ; John v. 24, vi. 63, xv. 3, referred to . . 57, 58

Digitized by Google

PAGE

Answer to the question, "When previously to Christ's coming, did the Egyptians cry to Jehovah?" &c. 58
Isaiah xxxv. 10, "The ransom of the Lord," &c. examined . ib.
Isaiah xlii. [2,] 51, "He shall not cry," &c. "The Lord is well pleased," examined . . . . ib.
2 Cor. v. 21; Isaiah liii. examined 59
Answer to the question, "Is not our repentance sufficient?" &c. ib.
Jer. xxiii. [5], xxxi. [31, 33]; 1 Cor. i. 30, examined . . 60
Ezek. xxxiv. 23; Dan. ix. 26, examined 61
Hosea iii. [5]; Joel ii. 28; Amos ix. [11], noticed . . . 62
Obadiah ver. 21, examined; Micah iv. and v. noticed 62, 63
Nahum i. 15; Hab. [ii. 4,] "The just shall live by his faith," compared with Rom. i. [17]; Gal. iii. 2, [11 ?] noticed . 64
Haggai ii. [6, 7, 9], examined . . . . ib.
Zech. iii. 8, 9, vi. 12, 13; Malachi iii. 1, noticed . . 65, 66
Jesus made no declaration respecting the design of his death . 66
Such expressions as "Jesus came to give himself a ransom for many," explained 67
Rom. iii. 24, "Being justified freely," &c. ch. viii. 32, 15, 16, 18, referred to 69
Locke's paraphrase on Rom. iii. 24, quoted . . . . . ib.
Locke's note on the word "Redemption" 70
Locke's note on the word "Mercy-seat" 71
Reference to a few texts explaining the terms "sacrifice," "ransom," "offering," &c. 71, 72
Of a two-fold nature in Christ 72
Allusion to the three-fold nature of a Hindoo incarnation . ib.
Solemn denial of ridiculing Christ's intercession 73
The Editor's assertion, that "the blood of no mere creature could take away sin," noticed . . . . ib.
The Editor's assertion, "As to the appointment of Jehovah by Jehovah, and his atoning for sin," noticed . . . . ib.
Arguments in proof of the finite effects of Christ's appearance on earth, adduced 75
The Israelites punished finitely for sins committed against the infinite God . . . . ib.
1 Chron. xxi. 11 [12] and 15; Judges xiii. 1, referred to . 76
Infinite reward for a good act performed for the propitiation of the infinite God 76, 77
The phrases "everlasting fire," and "everlasting punishments," explained; Gen. xvii. 8, xlix. 26; Hab. iii. 6, referred to . 77

Digitized by Google

PAGE

CHAPTER III.

Inquiry into the doctrine of the Trinity 78
The term Trinity not found in the Scriptures . . . . ib.
Gen. xlviii. 16, "The angel which redeemed me;" xxxi. 13, "I am the God of Bethel;" Exod. iii. 2, "In a flame of fire," examined . . . . ib.
Judges ii. 1, "I brought you out of Egypt;" Gen. xxii. 12, "Thou hast not withheld thy son," examined . . 79
Isaiah lxiii. 9; Ruth iv. 14; Nehem. v. 8, referred to, . 79,80
An allusion to a three-fold nature of Christ . . . 80
Psalm xcvii. 7; Judges xiii. 21, 22; Job i. 6, "The sons of God," 81
Judges xiii. 16; 2 Sam. xxiv. 16, referred to . . . . ib.
Isaiah x. 4—7, xxix. 1, [1—3,]; Micah iv. 13, v. 1, referred to 82,83
Exod. iii. 14, "Thus shalt thou say, I am that I am;" John viii. 24, "If ye believe not that I am," ver. 58, examined . ib.
Matthew xxiv. 5, "I am Christ," and John iv. 25, 26; ii. 19—21, ferred to 84, 85
Psalm lxxxix. 27; [1] Chron. xiv. 8, xviii. 1—8, referred to . 87
[1] Chron. xx. 2; 2 Kings v. 26, 27; Exod. xxiii. 21, referred to 89, 90
Prophets performing miracles sometimes without oral addresses to God; John xi. 41, 42, referred to 90
The phrase "To trust in him," examined 91
Proverbs xxxi. 11; Isaiah xiv. 32, referred to . . ib.
Jer. xvii. 5, explained . . . . ib.
Psalm xxiv. [1, 2] "The earth is Jehovah's," &c., compared with John i. 3, examined . . . . ib.
Heb. i. 2; Eph. iii. 9, referred to; 1 Cor. x. 25, 26, "Whatsoever is sold," &c. compared with Psalm xxiv. 1, examined 92, 93
Heb. i. 2; John iii. 35, referred to 94
1 Cor. x. 22, "Do we provoke the Lord?" &c. examined . ib.
1 Kings xix. 10, referred to 95
Psalm xxiv. 8, compared with Eph. iv. 8, examined . . ib.
Psalm lxviii. 18, referred to; Locke's note quoted . . . 96
Psalm xxxvi. 1, "O Jehovah thou preservest," &c. compared with Col. i. 17; Heb. i. 3, examined 97
John xvii. 2, v. 30, and John xiv. 24, "The word which ye hear," &c. Matt. xxviii. 18, referred to 99
Psalm xlv. 6, as quoted in Heb. i. 8, "Thy throne, O God," &c. examined . . . . ib.

Digitized by Google

PAGE

The Editor's substitution of the term "Jehovah" for "God," noticed 99
Direct application of Psalm xlv. to Solomon, illustrated . 100
Psalm cii. 25—27, referred to 101
Heb. i. 10—12, "Thou, Lord, in the beginning," &c., examined ib.
Deut. xxxii. 10; Isaiah xlix. 16; Psalm xlvii. 3; Matt. xxii. 45, referred to 102, 103
The Editor's substitution of the term "Jehovah" for "Lord" noticed . . . . ib.
The Editor's endeavor to weaken the force of the evidence respecting the changeable nature of Christ 104
1 Cor. xv. 24, 25, and 28, referred to . . . . . . ib.
Application of the term "shepherd," examined . . . 106
Isaiah lxiii. 11; Jer. xxiii. 4, "I will set up shepherds over them," &c., referred to . . . . ib.
Ezek. xxxiv. 23, "I will set one shepherd," &c., examined . ib.
Eph. iv. 18, compared with Psalm lxviii. 18, "Thou hast ascended on high," examined; Alquoran, ch. i. quoted . 108, 109
From a Jewish book of prayers, "Sabbath Morning Service," "Jewish Morning Service;" Alquoran ii. 5, quoted . . 110
Hosea ii. 15—17, 19; The context of ver. 18, referred to . 111, 112
The Editor's attempt to invalidate the argument founded on John x. 34 113
Figurative application of the terms "The sons of God," "The first-born of God," &c., noticed . . . . ib.
Luke ii. 7, 21, 40, 42, 51, 52; Matt. xi. 19; Mark iii. 5; John iv. 6, xii. 27, xiii. 5, 21; Luke xxii. 44; Mark xiv. 34; Matt. xxvii. 50; Phil. ii. 8, referred to, ... 114
The commonly-received doctrine of Christ's two-fold nature, noticed 115
Moses and the chiefs of Israel termed gods and men, and equally with Jesus said to have performed most wonderful miracles 116
Terms, phrases or circumstances strictly applicable to God alone when ascribed to created beings, to be interpreted *in an inferior sense* . . . . ib.
The argument of Moses and others being types of Christ, noticed . . . . ib.
Exod. xxv. 8; Deut. vii. 6, x. 15, xiv. 1, referred to . . 117
Deut. x. 17, John xx. 17; Psalm xlv. 7, referred to . . ib.
The context of ch. xv. [John x.] 34, referred to . . . 118
1 Cor. x. 9, "Neither let us tempt Christ," examined . . ib.
The Editor's last assertion on this subject examined . . 119

Digitized by Google

PAGE

Isaiah lxiii. 5, "Mine own arm;" and Rev. i. 8, "I am Alpha and Omega," examined 120
Gen. xxv. 30, [Jer.] xlix. 7, 13, 8, 9, 11, referred to . . 121
Inconsistency of ascribing to Jesus the following expressions: "I will tread them," "Their blood shall be upon my garment" 122
Isaiah lix. 15—17; Dan. vii. 9, referred to . . . 122, 123
Rev. i. 8, and its context, examined 123
Psalm lxxviii. [13], "He divided the sea," noticed . . 124
Psalm xcv. [6, 7], "For Jehovah is a great God," examined . *ib.*
Examination of John x. 30, "I and my Father are one," deferred; Heb. iii. 3, 4, noticed; Verse 6, referred to . 125, 126

SECTION SECOND.

On the Prophets 126
Prov. viii. 1, "Doth not wisdom cry?" &c. ver. 22, 27, 30, examined 127
Psalm cxxx. 7, lxxxv. 10; Numb. xvi. 46, referred to . . 129
1 John iv. 8; John i. 1; 1 Cor. i. 24, 30; 2 Cor. v. 21; Deut. xxviii. 37; Zech. viii. 13; Gen. xii. 2; Zech. ii. 5, referred to *ib.*
Isaiah vi. 1, 10, compared with John xii. 41, examined . . 130
The context of ver. 41, referred to . . . . . . *ib.*
Rom. xi. 7, 8; Isaiah lxiii. 17, referred to 131
Verse 41, compared with John viii. 56 132
Deut. xxviii. 28, xxix. 4; 1 Kings xviii. 37, referred to . 133
Isaiah vii. 14, "Behold, a virgin shall conceive," compared with Matt. i. 22, 23, examined . . . . *ib.*
The term "shall conceive," considered 134
Gen. xvi. 11, 4, 5; Jer. xxxi. 8; 2 Sam. xi. 5, and Isaiah xxvi. 17; Gen. xxxviii. 24, 25, referred to 135
Exod. xxi. 22; 2 Kings viii. 12; Amos i. 13, referred to . *ib.*
Isaiah vii. 14; Micah iv. 10; Isaiah xxiii. 12, referred to . 136
The inconsistency between Christ's being possessed of all power in his *human capacity*, and his not knowing good from evil in *that very capacity*; Luke ii. 46—50, referred to . . 137
The context of Isaiah vii. 14, compared with 2 Kings xvi. 5, et seq. referred to 139, 140
Matthew's reference to Isaiah vii. 14, in his gospel, compared 141
Dr. Campbell's authority quoted . . . . *ib.*
Hosea xi. 1, 3, noticed 142
Isaiah ix. 6, "For unto us a child is born," examined . . 143

Digitized by Google

PAGE
The context of the verse in question, compared [with] 2 Kings xv. 29, &c. xviii. 7, &c. referred to . . . 144—146
The decision left to the public 147
Difference between "to be," and "to be called," noticed . ib.
The phrases "no end," and "forever," or "everlasting," explained 148
Verses 1, 2, of Isaiah ix. applied in an accommodated sense to Jesus . . . . ib.
Matt. i. 23, "And they shall call his name Immanuel," explained ib.
Christian emperors addressed by the style "your divinity," "your godship" 149
Psalm lxxxix. 19, examined by a reference to its context . 150
Isaiah xxviii. 16, compared with Isaiah viii. 13; 1 Peter ii. 7, 8, "The stone which the builders," &c. examined . . 151
A proof of Christ's changeable nature 153
Isaiah xl. 3, "Voice of him," &c. and Mal. iii. 1, examined ib.
Reference to Mark i. 2, 3 . . . . ib.
The verse in question in the original Hebrew 155
Luke i. 69; John i. 29, 30, referred to . . . . . . ib.
Isaiah xl. 10, compared with Rev. xxii. 12, examined . . ib.
Acts xvii. 31; John viii. 28; xvii. 1, 2; Heb. i. 8, 9, shewing that Jesus, whether as man, son of man, or son of God, *was inferior* to the Most High, referred to . . . 157, 158
Isaiah xliv. 6, compared with Rev. i. 8, and xxii. 13, examined 159
Joshua v. 14; Numb. xxii. 31; Dan. ii. 46, referred to . 160
Rev. iii. 14; Col. i. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 24, referred to . 161, 162
Prophets and apostles represented as the searchers of hearts 162
Rev. xxi. 5, explained; Rev. xxii. 6—13, noticed . . 163, 164
Phrases in Rev. i. 1, and xxii. 6, compared 166
Jesus calls himself a servant of God, addresses Christians as his brethren, &c. 168
Several questions put to shew the inferiority of the Lamb 168, 169
A query in reply to one of the many insinuations of the Editor's 170
Isaiah xlv. 23, "Unto me every knee shall bow," compared with Rom. xiv. 10—12, examined . . . . ib.
John iii. 29; Eph. v. 23, compared with Isaiah liv. 5, examined 173
Jer. xxxiii. 16, examined; 1 Cor. xi. 3, referred to . 175, 176
The simple term "Jehovah" exclusively applied to God . 177
Jer. v. 22, examined 178
The Editor's position that Jesus "exercised absolute dominion in no name beside his own," examined 179
John x. 25, referred to; Jer. x. 11, examined . . . ib.
Heb. iv. 13, examined 181

Digitized by Google

PAGE
The reason for the different expressions used by God to the Prince of Tyrus, and to Jesus, explained 182
1 Cor. iv. 5, explained 183
That others besides Jesus were endued with the power of knowing the state of the heart, shewn 184
The perishable nature of Jesus and his kingdom, explained . 185
The epithet "Most holy," applied even to inanimate things *ib.*
The Editor's remarks on Hosea xi. 1, noticed . . . *ib.*
Hosea iii. 5; Acts ii. 21; 1 Cor. i. 2, examined . . 186, 187
Locke's paraphrase on 1 Cor. i. 2, and his note on Rom. x. 13, quoted 188
Amos iv. 13; Zech. iii. 2, and ii. 8, noticed 189

CHAPTER IV.

On the Editor's Replies to the Arguments contained in Chapter II. of the Second Appeal. Christ's possessing all power as a mediator noticed 192
Mercy ascribed to the Son, and justice to the Father, according to the Trinitarian system, noticed 193
All the power Jesus enjoyed was given unto him by God . 195
Attributes peculiar to God never ascribed to Jesus . . 196
Jesus was like the sun, an instrument in the hands of God . 197
Performing miracles and enabling others to perform them, were not peculiar to Jesus 198
The alleged compound nature of Jesus, noticed . . . 201
The terms "forever" and "everlasting" explained . . 202
Gen. xvii. 8; Jer. vii. 7; Dan. vii. 18, referred to . . . *ib.*
Phil. ii. 6, "Who being in the form of God," &c. examined *ib.*
The term "first-born" explained 207
Exod. iv. 22, [Jer.] xxxi. 9; Psalm lxxxix. 27, referred to *ib.*
Rom. viii. 29; 1 John iv. 7, referred to 208
Instances wherein Jesus himself and his apostles spoke of him as a creature . . . . *ib.*
Jesus's alleged two natures again noticed 210
The phrase "from the beginning" noticed 211
The Editor's introducing the two-fold nature of Christ . . *ib.*
Inconsistency of God's emptying himself of his glory and offering up supplications for the same, to himself 212
John xviii. 22, referred to; Micah v. 2, examined . . 213
The force of the words "son" and "own son" noticed . 216
Psalm lxvii. 6; 1 Tim. i. 2, referred to 218

PAGE

The phrase "only-begotten" noticed 219
John x. 30, "I and my Father are one," examined . . 220
One's calling God his Father cannot amount to his unity in nature with the Deity 222
Gen. ii. 24; Ezek. xxxvii. 19; 1 Cor. x. 17, referred to . 223
Such phrases as "he in God, and God in him," "God dwelleth in him, and he in God," noticed . . . . ib.
John x. 36, containing a disavowal of deity by Christ, explained 224
John x. [34—36] examined by its context 226
Jesus having died under the charge of making himself the Son of God, noticed 228
Heb. [i. 8;] "Thy throne, O God," originally applied to Solomon, again noticed 230
The phrase "forever" again noticed 231
John xx. 17, ascribed to Jesus in his human nature . . ib.
According to the Editor, one part of the same sentence spoken by Jesus in his divine, and another in his human capacity 232
John xx. 28, "My Lord and my God," examined . . ib.
John i. 1, "In the beginning was the word," &c. examined 234
Hindoo Polytheism compared with that maintained by the Editor 242
John xvi. 30, "Now are we sure that thou knowest all things," examined . . . . ib.
Paul, "God our Saviour;" 1 Peter, "The righteousness of God;" Jude, "To the only wise," &c. quoted by the Editor, noticed 243
Perishable nature of fictitious gods, noticed 244
Answers to the Editor's queries . . . . ib.
The will of God the Father sometimes found at variance with that of the Son, in Matt. xxvi. 39, and Mark xiv. 36 . ib.

CHAPTER V.

Remarks on the Replies to the Arguments found in Chapter Third of the Second Appeal 247
The Editor's First Position as to the ubiquity of Jesus, discussed ib.
John iii. 13, "No man hath ascended up," &c. examined . ib.
Translation of this verse by Dr. Campbell, quoted . . 257
Parkhurst's authority quoted . . . . ib.
Matt. xviii. 20, "For where two or three are gathered," &c. examined 259
The Editor's queries answered . . . . ib.

Digitized by Google

PAGE

The Editor's Second Position as to Jesus's ascribing to himself a knowledge and an incomprehensibility of nature equal to God, discussed 261
Matt. xi. 27, "No man knoweth the Son," &c. examined . *ib.*
1 John iii. 1, referred to; The Improved Version quoted . 263
The Editor's Third Position, as to Christ's exercising in an independent manner the power of forgiving sin, discussed . 264
Mark ii. 5; Matt. ix. 2, examined; Matt. ix. 8, referred to . *ib.*
Acts v. 31, xiii. 38, referred to 266
The Editor's Fourth Position, respecting almighty power being claimed by Jesus, discussed . . . . *ib.*
John v. 19—36, explained . . . . *ib.*
The work of judging men is not peculiar to Jesus . . 270
John v. 23, separately examined . . . . *ib.*
Gal. iv. 14; Matt. x. 25, xix. 19, referred to 271
Gen. iii. 22, referred to; Matt. xx. 14, noticed . . . 272
Matt. xx. 23, referred to 273
The Editor's Fifth Position, as to all judgment being committed to Jesus, discussed . . . . *ib*
Mark xiii. 32, referred to 274
The Editor's Sixth Position, as to Jesus' accepting worship due to God, discussed . . . . *ib.*
The term "worship" defined 275
The ancient prophets' receiving worship in the same sense that Jesus received it 276
Invocation by Stephen, explained . . . . . . *ib.*
Christ's offering worship, prayers, and thanks to God, mentioned 277
The Father, his Christ, and the apostles, acquitted of the charge of encouraging idolatry . . . . *ib.*
The Editor's Seventh Position, as to the Deity of the Son, and Personality of the Holy Ghost from the institution of baptism, discussed 278
Exod. xiv. 31; [2] Chron. xx. 20; Luke iii. 16, referred to 280
The terms "son" and "servant" equally manifest inferiority 282
The Editor's queries answered . . . . *ib.*
Matt. xxviii. 20, examined 283

CHAPTER VI.

On the Holy Spirit and other subjects 284
Brief notice of the Holy Spirit by the Editor, noticed . . *ib.*
Acts x. 38; Luke iii. 16, referred to 285

Digitized by Google

653

PAGE

Such expressions as "The Holy Spirit will teach you," &c. noticed 286
Acts v. 3, examined . . . . *ib.*
Matt. x. 40; 1 Cor. viii. 12, referred to; Acts x. 20, examined 287
Isaiah xlviii. 16, with its context, examined . . . 288
2 Cor. xiii. 14, examined 291
Zech. xii. 10, "And I will pour upon the house of David," &c. examined 292
Parkhurst's authority quoted 293
Exod. i. 1; Gen. xliv. 4, iv. 1; Deut. vii. 8, referred to . 294
Zech. xiii. 7, "Awake, O sword, against my shepherd," examined *ib.*
Rom. ix. 5, "God blessed forever," examined . . . 296
1 Cor. viii. 6; Eph. i. 17, iv. 5, 6, referred to . . . 297
1 John v. 20, "This is the true God," examined . . . *ib.*
The practice of the primitive Christians, noticed . . 298
Mosheim's authority noticed . . . . *ib.*
John xx. 31, quoted . . . . *ib.*
Authority of Locke and Newton noticed 299
The term "Antichrist" examined 302
The doctrine of Polytheism is similar to that of a plurality of persons 303
The Author's expression of thanks to God for enjoying Civil and Religious Liberty. . . . . *ib.*

Digitized by Google